A

301

MYLD AND

IVST DEFENCE OF CERTEYNE AR-
GVMENTS, AT THE LAST SESSION OF
Parliament directed to that moſt Honorable High Court, in behalfe of the Miniſters ſuſpended and *deprived &c: for not Subſcribing and Conforming themſelues etc.*

AGAINST AN INTEMPERAT AND VNIVST CONSIDERATI-
on of them by *M. Gabril Powell.* The chiefe and generall *contents wherof are breefely layd downe immediatly after the Epiſtle.*

G. Powell.

Let there be no ſtrife I praye thee betweene thee and me, for we be brethren: Gen. 30: 8.

Reply.

The wordes of his mouth were ſofter then butter, yet warre is in his heart: His wordes were more gentle then oyle, yet they were ſwords. Pſal: 55, 21.

Out of one mouth proceedeth bleſſing & curſing: my brethren theſe things ought not to be ſo. Iames 3. 10.

My little children let vs not loue in word neyther in tongue only, but in deed and in truth: 1 Ioh: 3: 18:

Imprinted, 1606.

TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE AND *MOST CHRISTIAN HIGH COVRT OF PAR-*liament which lately was, and ſhortly agayne is to be *aſſembled.*

RIght Honorable and moſt Chriſtian Senat, as at your laſt Seſſion, there were certayne Arguments directed unto You for the quickening of your godly Zeale to ſpeake, not onely boldly, but alſo in all humilitie to the Kings moſt excellent Maieſtie, for the Miniſters ſuſpended and deprived for not Subſcribing and Conformyng themſelues to ſome preſent Conſtitutions, and as ye did graciouſly accept of the ſayd Arguments, and moſt worthily acquite your ſelues to the utmoſt of your powers, touching the matter pleaded for by them: ſo now vouchſafe (I moſt humblie beſeech you) the like favorable acceptance of a ſober, modeſt, and iuſt defence of the ſame Arguments againſt a late uncharitable, unchriſtian, bitter, calumnious, and cavilling anſwer, publiſhed under the title of A conſideration *of them by* M. Gabril Powel. *I am bold in ſteed of the author himſelfe of the Arguments, to take the defence of them upon me, and to preſent them to your Honors, becauſe* M. Powel *himſelfe in his ſaid pretended anſwer unto them, hath ſo often referred the iudgment of the Arguments of his* conſideration *of them, and of the whole cauſe, to your moſt graue and gracious company. Yea, there is nothing that I am more willing unto, or which I doe more earneſtly deſire, then that the cauſe betwixt* M. Powel *and all thoſe for whom he pleadeth on the one parte, and the author of the Arguments and me the defendant with all other in whoſe behalfe we ſpeake on the other parte, might be iudiciouſſy and equally heard at the barre of your moſt* Chriſtian Court. *But the truth is, be-*

304

cause we desire and endeavor this, hinc illæ lacrymæ. *Hence is their chiefe hatred of us, their great contention with us, and their bitter writing against us. Notwithstanding though now we be unjustly charged as writing from* Cimerian *darknes, for concealing our names; yet if publike libertie might be granted to both parts, to stand before your iudgment seat, there freely to plead & debate the cause by the word of God, and that neither the worldly might and pompe of our adversaries, nor our meannes and baseness might be respected, but the truth it selfe simplie considered and regarded, we would also accoumpt it as a singular mercy of God, and as a speciall favor of you towards us in that behalfe.*

In the meane time, I doe in all humility referr the Argumēts, togeather with the defence of them to your graue and iudicious consideration against your next meeting in Parliament: not doubting but that the equitie of the cause, and the innocencie of our selues will therby be so apparant unto you, that though before som perhaps among you, did thinke the one not to be so iust, and the other not so free from all blame, yet when ye shall agayne assemble, ye will all with one mouth as one man, both iustifie the cause, and also speake more then ever before ye haue don, for favor unto vs, and to our people: betwixt whom the bond before made by the Church, and sealed by the holy Ghost in the effects of our Ministery, cannot by any Lordly Episcopall severity be iustly dissolved.

I doe further likewise humblie craue your Honorable lawfull favor more specially towards me (if at any time I shall be discovered) against all those that shall not well brooke the sober and modest taxing of their corruptions in this defence: especially considering the same is not done of any contentious minde; but onely in lone of the truth, to support it against those that deprave it: and in regard of our owne good names, to mainteyne our owne innocency against those that under the name of brethren, doe most unbrotherly disgrace us.

More

Moreover, if any thing in this defence following, or in the Arguments themselues, by the malice of any shalbe wrested and perverted, thereby also to wrest and pervert the law to the danger of the severall authors of the one or the other (being found out) may it likewise please you, in all lawfull and righteous manner to put forth your selues for protection of the sayd authors: as chiefly becauſe such wresting of words and perverting of iudgment, may procure Gods iudgments against themselues that shall so offend, and against the whole land; so likewise becauſe to speake in such matters and for such persons (whatsoever the answerer saith to the contrary) shall not only bring much peace & comfort to such speakers themselues, but shall also be beneficiall to the whole land, as is shewed in the Arguments, nothing infringed or weakened, by all M. Powels *opposition unto them.*

Yea let this consideration be a third reason to moue you the rather so to speake, viz. that if one man had the divinity & knowledge in law, as also all other learning, wit and wisdom of all men, yet could he not so warily and circumspectly write in all things, but that some wrangler or other (instructed and set a worke by the serpent, that is more subtle, not onely then all beasts, but also then all men now living on the earth) might and would find some matter or other, wherby to molest and trouble him.

I had thought much more to haue enlarged this my preface, but the prolixity of the defence it selfe much exceeded my first purpos, I will here conclude, both humblie and with all thanks to God & to your selues acknowledging your most religious & gracious endeavors at your last Session for the cause and for the persons pleaded for in the argumēts; and most heartily & instantly likewise praying for you & yours as Nehemiah *prayed for himselfe: viz. that* God in goodnes would remember you *(and yours)* according to all that ye haue doone for vs: and that he will never wype out your kindnes that ye haue shewed on the house of your God, and on the officers thereof. Nehem: 5: 19. & 13: 4:

A BREEFE NOTE OF SOME OF THE CHIEFE generall poynts handled in this defence following.

1 That the author of the Arguments is falsly accused to impute any dissembling or equivocating to the Kings most excellent Majesty, but that in all things he hath conceaved and written most reverently, Christiantly and duetifully of his Majestie.

2 That he is as vntruely charged with any vndutifull speeches against the Nobility, or any other that haue obeyed his Majesties proceedings

3 That the Ministers pleaded for are not refractary, superstitious, or schismaticall: neyther contronters of the Magistrat, or troublers of the state, but that these and other the like imputations doe rather belong to their accusers

4 That our Churches of England are in nothing so glorious state as is pretended by *M. Powel*, and other prelaticall persons but rather in divers respects, and for divers parts *thereof* in lamentable condition.

5 That the late proceedings of the Prelats against such Ministers for not subscribing, conforming etc: & that many of the late *Canons* or cõstitutions are contrary to the word of God, & the lawes of this Realme.

6 That the oth likewise *Ex Officio* is repugnant to the lawes of this Realme: yea abrogated by them, & only inforced by forreyne Canons.

7 That the obedience & loyaltie of the Ministers for conscience of Gods word not conforming themselues, is as good as of the greatest conformitans, yea that their not conforming theselues in that respect, maketh more then conformity for the good & safetie of his Majestie.

8 That the Considerer of the arguments, in his inconsiderat consideration of them, hath most unreverently and undutifully censured the High Court of Parliament, for their late most religious indeavors in behalfe of the Ministers pleaded for in the sayd Arguments.

9 That the Ministers soe deprived, doe not forsake their callings.

10 That although the number of the Ministers so deprived be but smal in comparison of other, yet the deprivation of them & the loss of their Ministery is dangerous for the whole Church in this kingdome.

11 That the Considerer of the arguments ofttimes offendeth in thos things which unjustly he objecteth unto the author of the arguments: viz: in sophistications in generall, and particularly in begging of the question: as also in equivocations, & in vayne repetitions of the same things for encreasing of his volume: and lastly incontradicting himselfe, yea sometyme in one and the same place.

12 That he and other the Prelats most striving for conformity, doe attribut more to conformitie, then to any more materiall & principall duties of the Ministery expresly commanded by God.

307

A DEFENCE OF THE ARGVMENTES

Lately directed to the High Court of Parliament for *the Miniſters ſilenced ect, againſt the anſwer unto them by* M. Gabriel Powell.

All though the late anſwer of *M. Powell* to the Arguments in the title mentioned, for moment of matter be not ſuch, that either any diſgrace of the ſayd Arguments or of the cauſe it ſelfe, with any wiſe and judicious reader, neede to be feared thereby; or that therefore the ſaid anſwer ſhould haue reply thereunto: yet for their ſake that are not ſo judicious; and that neither the anſwerer himſelfe, neither any other by our ſilence may haue any cauſe to inſult and triumph, as having wonne ſome great field, and gotten ſome worthy victory, I haue preſumed to take upon me the replying thereunto, inſteed of the author himſelfe.

Heerein (notwithſtanding the anſwerer his ſcoffing at our triobular Pamphlets) I will labour as much as I may for brevity, that ſo the Chriſtian reader may the leſſe behindred from his other waighty affayres. For this cauſe I nether will reply to the whole anſwer, neither will cauſe the ſayd anſwer to be wholly reprinted, but will onely moſt breifly collect ſuch things, as may moſt ſeeme to requyre reply; but yet with ſuch faithfullnes, that the anſwerer ſhall haue no juſt cauſe to complayne of the ſayd collections, as unjuſt, or not agreeyng to his owne words. The marginall notes I will reply unto by themſelues, and

308

that according to the letters prefixed unto them: and the rest that he writeth, in that order they are by himselfe set downe.

But before I proceede any further, let me admonish *M. Powel* of one fault in him, and common to many other of that side; that is to attribute that to all of vs which is done by any one. I meane in things which they thinke to be blameable. These Arguments were written by one alone, yet whatsoever he can by hooke or crooke gather as worthy of rebuke or shew of rebuke, that he imputeth to all that craue any favour? In good thigs they deale not so, but that which is well sayd or done by one is imputed to one onely, so that the rest fare not the better thereby. My humble desire therfore is, that howsoever thes men deale with vs, yet that other would deale otherwise. viz. That if there be any thing blamable in the Arguments, or in any other one mans writing of our side, it may be taken as the fault onely of one, and not imputed to all. Especially let this be considered, when there is no fault at all, but onely by surmise, and upon uncharitable misconstruyng & wresting of a mans words. It was the fault of *Saule*, for the supposed offence of *Abimelech*, to kill both him, and also all the rest of the Lords Preists. It was the sinne of *Haman*, for the suspected pride of *Mordecai* in not bowyng unto him, to hate him & all the Iewes, and to plot and contriue the ruine of them all. So the Apostle noteth it as a fault of the heathen, *that knew not God, and were given over to a reprobate mind, to take all things in tha evill part*. Rom. 1. 24. Let this therefore be the sinne of such wicked men, but let all true Christians that loue and feare the Lord, be free therof. Now to proceed, I will beginne with the preface.

Touc-

TOuching the preface there being not much therein which is not afterward mentioned in the rest of the booke, I may the more cursorily passe and rune it over. 389

The first poynt here to be observed, as also in the place of scripture subscribed to the title *Gen. 13. 8.* Is that he calleth vs *brethren*, as if he did so account and regard us. Notwithstandidg whether he doe any otherwise, or with any other minde so call us, then only as *Ioab* called *Amasa his brother* with his mouth, and yet at the same instant killed him with his hand. 2 Sam. 20 9. I leaue it to be judged by his opposition to our petition, by his most unchristian, & vncharitable raylings, revilyngs, reproches & scoffs, as also by his most unjust collections; as directly contrary to the words, & much more to the meaning of the author of the said Arguments, so likwise to all reason, & common sense. Sharpnes & bitternes are the common weapons and principall armour of that side, which is an evidence of the badnes of their cause, and no lesse testimony of the goodnes of ours. For truth and righteousnes can support themselues without any such meanes. Notwithstanding in this kind, this answerer hath farre exceeded many other, yea, he may well be acknowledged to haue wonne the spurres from many other. They commonly object this fault unto us, and it may be some one of his private motion and disposition, doth a litle somtyme offend this way, to the greife of the rest that favor the cause. But if all speeches of that kind that haue ever been used by any of our side, were gathered into one (truely and without any wresting) they would not a mount to the number proportionably, that is apparant and evident in this answer.

The which fault is so much the greater, because the ar-

guments are propounded with all temperance, & without any just occasion to provoke him, except it be as a weake stomake is sicke with the best and most wholsome meate. Notwithstandyng I do the lesse marveile hereat, because as the more extreame the loue of *Amnon* was towardes *Tamar* at the first, and the more extreame also his hatred against her afterward, *2. Sam. 13. 15.* So this is often to be observed, that such as sometime haue been most hott in dislike of the corruptions of our Church, they changing their minds and for preferment conformyng themselues, haue become more bitter and heavie adversaryes, then any of those that were never other thē conformable men. But was *M. Powel* at any time of such a minde? Yea certainly within these few yeares he was so over strong, that he called the Communion booke a Mass booke. At another time likewise being at a Church, and hearing the Latiny, he rose up saying, come let us goe, what, shall we now heare conjuring? So likewise the time hath been when some other (now very conformable) haue publikly in pulpit (I will not say in my hearing) to the disgrace of the Bishops sayd, *If ever the Bishops doe good in the Parliament house let me be damned*. Many other the like instances might be named, But I regard brevity. These things wilbe justified. Did any of vs ever so be haue our selues? If we had, we might be justly blamed in that behalfe. But I will presse this poynt no further. I haue the rather reported this, for the better answer of the matter of giddines afterward by him objected unto us.

2 The next poynt in the preface, is, that he chargeth us with emulation of forreyne novelty.

Ans. Neither noveltie, nor forreyne. We desire nothing, wherein we haue not proved our desires by such Arguments

311

ments of Gods word (the best antiquitie, and besides which, the more auncient any thing is, the more rotten is the same) such arguments (I say) as never haue been yet sufficiently answered. Touchinge the word *forreyne*, though indeed the thinges desired by us are in all Churches of other Countryes fully reformed in doctrine with ours, yet those Churches being all the same houshould of faith that we are, they are not aptly called forreyne. As Englishmen travelyng in other Countryes and livyng after English fashion, are not therfore Forreyners in respect of England whiles they so travell, but still to be accounted of the same country, so all Churches and all members of the Church, in what Country so ever they be, are not to be accounted Forreyners one to another, because they are all Citizens of heaven, and we make all one family or body.

Besides, the thinges in controversie which we desire to be removed, may much more justly be called both *Noviltie* & *Forreyne*, because they were not of Apostolicall institution, neyther heard of in the Apostles time, yea, condemned by generall arguments in the writinges of the Apostles, as hath been shewed in divers other bookes written one our side, not yet answered: especially in the Abridgment made by the Ministers of *Lincolne Diocesse*, the Demaunds, and in the 12 Arguments: as also because they are in use in more Forreyne Popish Synagogues, then there are reformed Churches in all Europe. Lastly, although Communion with the Churches of Christ in what country soever, be much more to be respected, then fellowship with the sinagogues of Antichrist, yet we do not therefore desire that which we doe, because it is in other Churches, but because the word requyreth the same.

G. Powel They refuse to conforme them selues.

Answer. None of vs haue ever had the booke of Common prayer authorized by Act of Parliament 1 Eliz. And some of vs haue never had the book now vrged by the Bishops provided for us, or tendred unto us: How then haue wee refused to conforme our selues? Yet we are deprived. By what right and equity I know not.

The auncient approved Discipline & Ceremonyes of our Church.

Not auncient, because they haue not warrant from God. Neither ever so approved, but that from the first Preachyng of the Gospell in this kingdome, they haue been by divers godly and learned men oppugned.

His Highnes sought to reclaime them by some correction of their obstinacy, as by silencyng etc.

That which his Majestie permitted on that behalfe, was qualified with gracious provisors; 1. To proceede no otherwise therein then accordyng to the lawes of God and the land. 2 To execute even that with all mildnes & moderation. And thirdly, to endeavore to perswade by all arguments, rather thē by censures: which things because they haue not been done, but that in many respectes the Bishops and other Prelats haue exceeded their commission, we doubt not but that if it might please some attending upon his Highnes and in grace with him, in all humble manner to informe him, we doubt not (I say) but that his Majestie, accordyng to his most christian disposition, would graciously respect the humble desires of his subjects therein. Touchyng the other parte of *M. Powels* speech, it is no small abuse of his Majestie to impute unto him the severitie of the Bishops against us: whereas in truth whatsoever his Majestie doth therī, is only through their importunity, and by their accusing us of schisme, disorder, sedition etc.

The

The moderat ſeverity of the Biſhops, is unfitly and unduetifully termed oppreſſion, and cruelty. *Gab. Powel*

Is it moderate ſeveritie to turne ſo many Miniſters as are now ſilenced, out of their livyngs? Yea, to provide alſo, that they ſhall haue no other way or meanes whereby to liue, that ſo they, their wiues and children may goe a-begging, to the diſgrace of the goſpell, the diſhonor of the land, the greife of the godly, and the joye of the wicked? Eſpecially, is it moderate ſeverity ſo to doe for ſuch cauſes? Did they ever read in any antiquity, ſo many of ſuch quality, & whoſe labours God had ſo bleſſed, to be thruſt and caſt out as unſavory ſalt in the time of the goſpell, in a kingdome whereof both King and people doe profeſſe the goſpell, and in an age, in reſpect of the ſinnes thereof, requyering ten tymes as many preachers more then their are, if they could be gotten? If theſe be the mercyes of the Biſhops, what would be their crueltyes? If this be their moderat ſeverity, what would be their extremity if they might be ſuffered? Anſw.

If a Father ſhould caſt his ſonne out of houſe & home, & utterly diſinherit him, becauſe he would eat no cheeſe, were this moderat ſeverity? What then may be ſayd of them that caſt out other from the inheritãce of the Lord, whoſe labours God hath bleſſed to the joye of many an elect ſoule, & that only for not doyng that, againſt which they can yeeld a farre better reaſon from God his will revealed in his word, then any man can doe for his not eating of cheeſe or for any other the like action, from the ſecret inſtinct of nature?

The author of theſe arguments, is not a frayd, to perſwade & provoke vour Honorab'e Court (theſe are his owne words) to intercede with his Majeſtie, that he would compell the Reverend Pre'ats to furceaſe their rigorous and cruell dealing. G. Powel

314 The Apostle biddeth vs *to provoke one another to loue & to good works.* Heb. 10. 24. Therefore why might not the author of these arguments use this word unto the Parliament for so good a worke, as in all the said arguments is intended. But for the latter words of *M. Powel, to compell the Reverend Prelats* to surcease their rigorous and cruell dealing etc. Where doth the author use them? The drifte of all the arguments insinuateth so much. If it be but insinuation, then all the words before set downe, are not the expresse owne words of the author, as *M. Powell* hath said.

2 It may be taken for granted, that the sayd Prelats are so resolute for mainteyning of their Hierarchie, Discipline, Ceremonyes, and other conformity, that they will not yeeld one inche, yea not to his Majestie, exceept they be compelled.

Cab. Powel The Prelats haue soberly and temperatly caryed themselues in their proceedings.

Answ. We will all with one accord most thankfully acknowledg this, when we shall find it. In the meane tyme, we do acknowledge it comparatiuly true, in respect of their wils and desires. For by this answer written by their authority and by divers other tokens, it is apparant that they would gladly provoke us to giue them further advantage against vs, and also that for these causes they would doe more thē they doe (yet I speake not of all, I doe unfainedly confess that their is great difference of affections amongst them it respect of us) they would I say doe more then they doe If they feared not the people? No, but if his Majestie, his most Honorable counsell would giue them leaue: and if they feared not as much indignation from his Highnes as now they seeme to be in grace with him; and as much opposition by the honorable Counsell, as now perhaps they

seeme

ſeeme to haue furtherance by ſome of them that do not ſo well underſtand the cauſe.

Their obſtinat ſuperſtion hath worthely made them ſubject to the proceedings of the *Biſhops*. G. Powel

What? Superſtition? And obſtinate ſuperſtition? We were never before (to my remembrance) charged with ſuperſtition, much leſſe with obſtinat ſuperſtition: but haue alwayes been accounted great adverſaryes to ſuperſtitiō. Yea, we hate it with a perfect hatred, yea our ſoules abhorre and deteſt the leaſt ſuperſtition, much more obſtinat ſuperſtition, as much as the beſt of them doe hate it: yea, much more then ſome of them: it is one of our reaſons againſt ſome poynts of conformitie, that we judge them ſuperſtitious. How then may we be charged with ſuperſtition? Yea with obſtinat ſuperſtition? But what if we were ſuperſtitious? May we therfore be puniſhed cō-trary to law, or aboue that that the law requyreth? Were not this to ad tranſgreſſion to tranſgreſſion, and to puniſh ſinne with ſinne? We may not doe evill, that good may come thereof. *Anſw.*

The author cryeth out, as if the goſpell by ſuch proceedings were baniſhed, Gods worſhip prophanely adulterated, to the eternall perill of many thouſand ſoules. G. Powel

Where is this outcry? It is very low and ſoft, in ſome ſecret corner, or written in very ſmall letters, that no man can ſee or heare of it. The author might well cry out, that the *goſpell is in part baniſhed*, by the ſuppreſſion of ſo many able, godly, faithfull & paynefull miniſters; that Gods worſhip is in part corrupted, both in the doctrine, eſpecially ſithens this late vehement ſtrivyng by our Prelats for conformitie (as ſhalbe afterwards touched) and alſo in the other publike exerciſes of religion by mixture of humane inventions, Ceremonyes and Traditions. Yea, *Answer.*

316 and that heerby we are in danger to haue *the candlestick removed, and the kingdome of Heaven taken from us, and given to a Nation more worthy then we*, except by *repentance & doing our first works* Revel. 2. 5. Yea, *making our last works more then our first vers. 19.* We doe in time prevent this judgment.

G. Powel The Parliament is able to convince him heerin of malepart Sycophancy, and manifest untruth.

Answer. I would such accusers (notwithstanding their such threats of the Parliaments kindnes) would stand with vs, & that we might be admitted to stand with them at the barre of the Parliament for triall of this accusation, and whether the author of those Arguments, or this answerer haue abused that most worthy Senat.

G. Powel This author feareth no rebuke of shame, for his vnconscionable dealyng.

Answer. Let this unsconscionable dealing be shewed in the author: or else let this answerer be ashamed.

G. Powel This man speaketh frō Cimmerian darknes, by concealing his nāe.

Answer. Then also by the same reason many books of the scripture, the writers whereof haue concealed their names, were written from Cimmerian darknes. The like may be sayd of many other most worthy Theologicall bookes, without name of any writer. Much more may the same be sayd of the booke intitled SCOTTISH GENEVATING & ENGLISH SCOTIZING, and many other such disgracefull and scornefull books published without name of any author, against the desired reformation, and all the favorers thereof. It is also the severitie of the Prelats that maketh vs the rather to conceale our names. If we had as much liberty to publish our books for our selues, as every rayler hath to put forth any thing against us: Yea, as there is for Printing of many profane, filthy, scurrilous, lascivious, &

un-

ungodly bookes authoriſed by ſome of them, you ſhould quickly ſee our names. 317.

The author is bold to offer his writing even to your Honors, to provoke you to ſupplicat to his excellent Majeſtie, in behalfe of their cauſe, or elſe to determine it of your ſelues. *Gab. Powel*

Anſw.

The author never deſired this determynation you ſpeake of by the Parliament, as though that would or might be authenticall without his Majeſties Royall aſſēt, but onely that his Majeſty thereby ſeeing the equity of the cauſe, and the affection of his people therunto, might alſo be the more eaſily perſwaded to vouchſafe his princly favour towards them therein.

I was cōmaunded by ſome in authority to peruſe and breifely to refute theſe Arguments, which at the firſt I was unwillyng to take vpon me. G. Powel

Anſwer.

If you be ſo ready to be commaunded to write againſt ſuch a cauſe, take heed you be not found *a ſervant of men*. But if any in authority haue cōmaunded you this worke, did they alſo commaund you to rayle and revile your *antagoniſt* (as you call him) in ſuch manner as you doe? It is lamentable that any in authority in ſuch a Chriſtian Church, ſhould either commaund any ſuch thing, or allowe of it being done. But it is more lamentable to obey. The time was when you did well employ your ſelfe againſt the Common adverſaryes. You did then runne well. What letted you that you did not hold on in that courſe? What hath provoked you to turn your pen from them, and to whet it now the ſecond time againſt thoſe, whom you call and ſhould in truth acknowledg your brethren? Doe you feare any violence from the Papiſts by holding on againſt them, becauſe perhaps of ſome former experience? Indeede, you may well feare ſuch violence from them, and be ſecure touchyng all danger from us,

318 because you haue learned from the *Apothegme* (after mentioned) of *D. Elmer* late *Bishop* of *London*, and much more from all experiēce, that you may justly feare your life and cuttyng of your throat in the company of one Papist, but that no such thing is ever to be feared amongst ten thowsand of (those whom it pleased him to call) prescisians.

G. Powel. In divers respects I feared to plead in so high a Court, before such judges etc. Yet the equity and holines of the cause moved me etc.

Answer. Why should you feare, being commaunded? Would not your commaunders beare you out? It may be they will before men, but who shall plead for you before God, except you repent? Take heed you commend not that to be equall and holy, which agreeth not with the wayes of God.

G. Powel. I presently resolued to stand in the gap and breach, between our brethren and vs.

Answer. This resolution upon bare commaundement of a man, (it may be also contrary to the likyng of some to whom you are more bound) was too present to be sound. How haue you stod in the gap & breach? By treading it down to make it lower that wild beasts, or at the least strang cattell may the more easily break in *to devoure the Lords vine*, and to *eate up the Lords people as it were bread.*

G. Powel. Albeit I knew my brethrens affections to be somewhat unkind, and their pens foule and shamefull.

Answer. Whereby knew you their unkindnes and foulnes towards you? Indeed they haue seene and dayly doe see your unkindnes towards them: yea towards the Lord, in opposing your selfe to the Lords cause, and to them in seeking therof, and that in this bitter manner: yea for the foulnes of your pen you might justly feare the like measure from them againe to you. *But God forbid that for that we should sinne against God, and cease praying for you.*

See-

Seeing it lyeth not in our powers to make them modeſt & peaceable, and that we are called to ſerue God and his Church, which we are bound to doe in good and evill report. *G. Powel* 319

Anſwer.

You ſhould firſt haue proved us immodeſt and unpeaceable, before you had uſed theſe wordes. God giue thoſe graces to you and us. The ſerving of God and of his Church, is not in rayling & reprochfull ſpeaches, in ſharpnes and bitternes, in untrue and unjuſt collections directly contrary to the words of our brethren. But what meãe you *by good and evell report?* If as patients, it is well: if as agents it is not ſo. But though by your booke I haue little cauſe, yet I will take you in the better ſence.

I pray our heavenly Father to forgiue them any injury ete. G. Powel

Before prayers you ſhould lay a ſide all wrath of heart, and bitternes of word. *Math.5.22.1 Tim.2.8.* Pray alſo for the forgivnes of the wrongs you doe to vs, both in this booke, and alſo in your latine treatiſe *De adiaphoris*. *Anſwer.*

I haue not with drawne my ſelfe from this worke, no not for the eſtimatiõ & reverence I haue of the graue judgments of your honors. *Gab. Powel*

If you had duely reverenced their Honors, you would haue feared the offering vnto them ſuch a preſent of raylings, vnjuſt collections etc. As if they had been voyd of judgement, not able to diſcerne of ſuch accuſations. Anſw.

I mayntaine here the glory of God, and honor of our Prelats. G. Powel

As our Saviour ſaid, *They ſhall excommunicate you, yea, the time ſhall come, that whoſoever killeth you, ſhall thinke that he doth God ſervice.* Ioh. 16.2. So this anſwerer thinketh that he glorifieth God by rayling on his cauſe & ſervãts. As for the Honor of our Prelats, you ſhould firſt haue been on a ſure ground for the lawfulnes thereof, before you had taken upon you (like a champion) the defence thereof. 2. Even a good cauſe is rather overthrowne then vpheld by ſuch meanes of ſcoffing and rayling, as in this *Anſwer.*

this booke you haue vſed. Thus much for the anſwer to the Preface of *M. Powels.*

320.

THE NEXT THING TO BE CONSIDERED is his marginall Notes vpon the preface of the author.

The firſt note with (a) I paſſe by.

G. Powel b This pretenſe unto the Chriſtian reader, is becauſe they would not ſeeme to be petitioners unto the Parliament.

Anſwer. What a ſtrange collection is this? Haue we expreſly directed all the ſaid argumẽts vnto the Parliament houſe, and yet would we not ſeeme to be petitioners unto thẽ? Nay rather ſith this anſwerer thus carpeth at theſe words *the Chriſtian reader*, gatthering from the humble petition of the Author of thoſe Argumentes *to the Chriſtian Reader etc.* that he would not ſeeme to be Petitioner to the Parliament, may not this be better gathered that the anſwerer diſtinguiſheth the chriſtian readers from the Parliament, and the Parliament from them, and ſo maketh the Parliament no chriſtian aſſembly? But why did the author uſe thoſe wordes, the chriſtian reader? The reaſon ſeemeth double: 1 becauſe he did ſo account of every one in the Parliament houſe: 2 becauſe he thought that thoſe arguments might come to the handes of other Chriſtian readers, then onely of Parliament men.

M. Powell maketh the Parliament no chriſtian aſſembly.

G. Powel c The ſupplicants make the profeſſion of the goſpell and all religion to conſiſt in refuſing cap, ſurplice, croſſe etc. Great cry, litle wooll.

Anſwer. This etc. After the word croſſe, is well added. For otherwiſe although we hold thoſe things to be matters of religion, yet never any of us did affirme all religion to cõſiſt in thẽ. without this etc. therfore, this is an unchriſtian ſlaunder, and to ſpeake according to the anſwerers learning in *Ariſtotles Eleuchs*, a fallacy *ab eo quod eſt ſecundum quid, ad id quod eſt ſimpliciter.* The adage in the end of this

note

note is *too homely* for that Honorable Court to whom the anſwerer ſpeaketh, as being taken from ſwyne, which for ſome cauſes (not fit to be written) being ſometimes ſhorne, make a great cry, & yeld litle wooll. And though the anſwerer by this *adage* ſeeme to eſteeme us no better then ſwyne, (as alſo in his other booke *De adiaphoris* it pleaſeth him to compare us to *Apes*) yet indeed may he well ſay that the moſt of us haue but litle wooll on our backes, we haue been ſo long and often ſhorne & ſhaven, that we haue nothing left but our very skine: Yet it may be that ſomme of our adverſaryes hope for wooll and fat from our livings.

d As if his Majeſtie would be diſpleaſed if any promoted a religious or honeſt cauſe. A malepart and preſumptuous (if not a diſloyall) cenſure. G. Powel

Is this man in his right minde, that he maketh ſuch collections? The author perſwadeth all men from all ſuch un-chriſtian and diſloyall ſuſpitions of his Majeſtie, how then may this note be applyed unto him. In the laſt Argument (or rather concluſion of all the arguments) where the author ſpeaketh of ſome that are alwayes accuſing and diſgracing the miniſters (pleaded for with Nobles and Princes,) the anſwerer maketh this marginall note, *An vniuſt calumny*. Whether it be ſo or no let all men iudge, as by his whole anſwer, ſo particularly by this note, and them that follow, yea by his whole anſwer to all the preface before the arguments. But to returne, ſith ſometymes ſome feare that even of Chriſtian Princes which they nether need nor ought to feare, what mallepartnes, preſumption, or diſloyaltie was there in the author to prevent ſuch feare. Doth not the Apoſtle often times Rom. 7. 7. and 9. 14. and Galt. 3. 21. and often elſe

Anſw.

contradiction in the anſwerer.

where, prevent objections that might, but needed not be made? Shall he therfore be charged with malepert presumption against God and his trueth?

G. Powel

e I knowe not wherto all his whole Paragraph tendeth, if the Supplicants deeme not his Maiesty to haue forsaken his first loue, and to haue revolted from religion, at least in shew for a time. (f) A malitious, uncharitable and unchristian allegation to be applyed unto the whole State (that loyally obey his Maiestie) especially to his Nobles and servants.

Answer

O uncharitable collections. Let the reader by them judge whither this man doe not accuse vs, and provoke (what he can) our gracious Prince, his Nobles and all other against us: Yea, directly contrary to the words of the author, who laboreth by the whole Paragraph spoken of by the answerer, to perswade all men to conceaue well & Honorably of his Majestie, according to many former most worthy testimonies of his Princely piety and religion. And albe it all in the sayd Paragraph be spoken onely to that purpose, yet the answerer wresteth the same as intended also against the whole State, especially against his Majestie, Nobles and servants. But *he that iudgeth righteously, to whom we commend the cause and our selues*, shall one day make our righteousnes knowne.

G. Powel

g If they had perticularly applyed these things, their mallice had been the more manifest.

Answer

It greeveth this answerer most, that we are not so malitious as himselfe, and that we giue no just occasion of further quarrell with us. When they want matter of just accusation, then they pretend that *aliquid latet quod non patet*, some thing is hid that is not manifest. But of this afterward.

G. Powel

h No bolder & securer censurers of all sorts & degres of men, under the cope of heaven, then these singular & selfe conceited refractaryes.

Answer.

Yes, this notary is a more bold and secure censurer, in

as

as much as in his notes before he hath censured the author of the arguments, and all other desiering that which he desireth, (of what sorte and degree soever) for that that is not expressed, neither intended, nor any wayes to be justly gathered from his words. When this censuring he speaketh of, is proved by any of us, let the partie against whom it is proved beare the blame thereof. If any man censure a tree according to the fruites it bearerh, he doth no more then he may.

i How prodigall they are of the Kings thanks. G. Powel

This note sheweth the prodigalitie of this answerers mallice and words. *Answ.*

The k. is answered before.

l Is a triobular pamphlet such an huge quantity or volume? It may seeme the pen man of this supplication was the worthy author of the late two leaved libels. G. Powel

Seeing *words* (as this answerer saith in his conclusion) *ought to be numbred to so great States*, why should respect of brevity be thus scornfully objected to the author? Especially considering the other manifold & waighty affayres of that Honorable assembly, unto whom the sayd Arguments were directed. If the Arguments were a triobular pamphlet, what would the answere haue been without them: especially without all his cavils, reproches, vnjust collections, vayne repetitions, and that false ground that alwayes he buildeth upon, viz. his supposition that we are schismaticks? The answerer his former booke also *De adiaphoris*, what were it with a lesse margine, without the great multiplicity of sections, and if every bird had her owne feather. The two leaved libells wherof he speaketh, are perhaps the more offensiue vnto him, because some of them doe attribute more authority to his Majestie, then they would haue us to doe, or then the prelats doe, that *Answer.*

 ~~the~~

~~the~~ challenge so much to themselues.

G. Powel

Such presumptuous and selfe conceyted *Elihues*, are these male content Ministers, who take upon them to instruct such, as be wiser then themselues. *Vide Gregorium in hunc locum.*

Answer.

What a thing is this? For want of matter against the author, this answerer falleth out with the worthy *Elihu*, as a presumptuous and selfe conceited man, whose wisedome notwithstanding, modestie, and singular humilitie are evident in holy scripture, by his silence till other (more auncient then himselfe) had spoken all they could, as also by his pleading the cause of God himselfe, when all the rest there present had geiven over the same, (in which respect also all in these dayes that plead for God against the oppositions of those that would be accounted the onely wise and learned men, are likewise reproched as presumptuous and selfe conceited) and lastly by the elegancy & eloquence of his speeches, and by the profound and divine matter therin conteyned. Finally are humble petitioners, that bow themselues to the ground, before them to whom they doe petition, are such petitioners (I say) before heaven and earth to be proclaimed presumptuous and selfe conceited instructers? Is this the man that erst now blamed other as bold and secure censurers?

A REPLY TO THE FVRTHER ANSWER OF the preface to the Arguments.

G. Powel

Some haue foolishly made a breach and division amongst us about crosse and surplice etc.

Answer

Wisedome consisteth *in understanding what the will of the Lord is*, Ephe. 5. 17. And in a conscience of keeping *Gods commaundements and observing his word*. Deut. 4. 6. The which to reject is the greatest folly *Ierem. 8. 9.* We haue made no breach or division at all: But as *Ioseph* for telling his divine dreames, was hated of his brethren, and at the

the last sold a way to strangers by themselues: and as the blinde man *Iohn 9.* for confessing Christ, and stoutly standing in that confession, was throwne out of the Iewish Synagogue by the Pharises, so (to use the words of this answerer) we are violently and unjustly broken of and divided, and thrust out of the ministery by other, and yet charged that we haue made a foolish breach and division. 325

Yet we doe all as hartily and faithfully loue and affect our Prince and King (yea of whatsoever religion) and are as ready and willing to defend his person & honor, against all adversaryes etc. And therefore I cannot allow the opinion of such as giue out, that these our factious brethren are as dangerous enimyes vnto the state as the papists etc. *G. Powel*

Answer.

Neither you nor any other, haue ever yet had, or ever (I hope) shall haue cause justly to speake, write, or thinke otherwise concernyng either our loue & loyalty towards our Soveraigne, or our duety to any of his governors: yea though we should cunningly be solicited to some vndutifull practises, as some not many yeares since were, in the dayes of late *Q. Elizab.* of most Honorable memory, who were so farr from enterteyning any such motions, as that most dutifully, they discovered the same to other in higher authority. Though (I say) we should be cunningly solicited to any undutifull practises or to the approbation of any such practise, yet I trust that never any of vs shall be found so to offend against his Majesties meanest and lowest officers.

D. *Elmer* late *B.* of London gravely sayd, If I were in the company but of one Papist, I might justly feare the losse of my life, but being amongst ten thousand Precisians, well might I be a frayd of my Bishopricke, but never of my throate: the one would cut my coate, and the other my throate. G. Powel

The *Precisians* (as it pleaseth *B. Elmer* to call them) never desired the Bishopprickes of any of their adversaryes, but onely that they would *giue glory to him that sitteth vp-* *Answer*

326 *on the Throne, and cast their miters at the feete of the Lambe,* acknowledging him worthy of all rule and Dominion,& contenting themselues with the places and Honors commended in the scriptures: according to an other apothegmaticall exhortation of the sayd *Bishop*, both made openly at Paules crosse, and also printed (before himselfe was so advanced in the world) viz. *that Bishops and other Prelats should come downe from their thowsands, and content themselues with an hundred, vntill which abasing of themselues, and resigning that which iniustly they hold, reigning as Lords & Kings over the Lords inheritance, neither the Church of God in generall, neither our Soveraigne in speciall, shall haue so much service, and good by their service, neither themselues so much peace and comforte of conscience, as otherwise would be.*

G. Powel Though they be free from suspition of treason and rebellion, yet it cannot be denyed, but that presumptuously and willfully, they contend with the Magistrat, impugning his authority in things indifferēt.

Answer. Cannot that be denyed, which never was, neither ever can be proved against us? 1 We deny that it is the Magistrats meere pleasure that we should conforme, otherwise then by mis information of our adversaryes against us, as *David* upon the like mis information of *Ziba* against *Mephibosheth*, gaue all to *Ziba* that had been *Mephibosheths* 2 Sam. 16.2. Yea, they doe not only giue all the mis informations them-selues against us which they can jmagine, or wherwith they are informed by other, but also they labour what they can to keep the Magistrats from all right information in our behalfe by any other: yea they indeavour their vtmost to keep both Parliament and all other, from mediation for us. 2 Though we yeeld not in all thinges required of us, yet it is not presumptuously and wilfully, but in all humility & modesty: we contend not

by

by the ſword nor any violence, but onely by word, yea, pleading the word of God for our cauſe. Our contentiō alſo is in a patient ſuffering, with a duetifull cleering of our innocency againſt the falſe imputations wherewith we are burdened. The things in queſtion haue been ſaid, but never ſubſtantially proved to be indifferent in ſuch ſorte, and to ſuch vſes as now they are urged. Our adverſaries haue ſo long ſtrivē to maintayne the things (which they call indifferent) for ſuch uſes as to which they are not indifferent, that they haue made religion it ſelfe an in different thing to many men. In things truely indifferent, it is already juſtified, and ſhalbe further juſtified (if neede requyer) that we attribute no leſſe to the magiſtrat, then our adverſaryes doe. Let them name in what ſenſe and degree the Papiſts deny the Soveraignty of Princes in any thinge, and I doubt not, but that it may be proved that themſelues (holding their owne principles) doe deny the ſame, in the ſame ſenſe and degree. 327

Allof them make a faction and ſchiſme in the Church for carnall reſpects: ſome becauſe they know not otherwiſe how to be mainteyned: ſome to gratifie their benefactors and Patrons and to pleaſe their frends: ſome for diſcontentment and want of preferment: ſome for giddines of innovation etc. G. Powel

What? all *M. Powell*? How doe you forget your ſelfe? You ſhould haue left this generall judgment of all, to the generall judge of all. There is none of theſe of whom you ſpeake, but for the world and outward things they might liue better conformyng then not cōforming themſelues. What benefit haue any by gratifiyng their Patrons? Will their Patrons giue them better mayntenance otherwiſe? Nay ſome Patrons are their adverſaryes, and are gratified by them that put ſuch Miniſters out, that ſo they may preſent againe etc. Some ſo diſpleaſe their frends heerby *Anſwer.*

328 that by their displeasure they loose more in one day then they get all their life by any Ecclesiasticall living. Some also by displeasing their frends doe not only lose temporall benefits for them and theirs, but doe also hinder themselues of as great Ecclesiasticall promotion, as many or the most of the conformable sort doe ateyne unto. Some by their troubles for this cause, having had good patrimonyes: haue consumed & wasted them so, that in their age (when they need most comfort) they liue in penury and want, and at their death leaue not so much to their wiues & many children, as was left to themselues a lone. Some by want for this cause, are forced to take their children of very great hope and forwardnes for learnyng frō the schoole, and to make them apprentises to their owne great greife, and in time to the detriment of the Church. Agayne, this imputation of carnall respects unto us (such as you reckon) is contrary to your often imputation of superstition unto vs. For what is superstition, but to make that sinne that is not sinne; and so to feare sinnyng against God, as that we doe not that which lawfully we may do: or one the contrary to make that good, holy, and necessary, that is nether good, holy, nor necessary, and so to think himselfe bound to doe that, which well he might leaue undone? If then we be superstitious, and doe that which we doe in fearing to sinne against God, how can such carnall respects as before are particularized, be imputed vnto us? But the truth is, that these carnall respects doe belong rather to conformity, for which many will doe any thing rather then they will loose their livyngs. Of how many also of them may it be sayd *that they seeke their owne, and not that which is Iesus Christs?* Philip. 2. 21. Yea, *that their belly is their God, their glory their shame, and that they mind earthly*

ly things? Philip. 3.19. that also with *Diotrephes*, that *loue to haue the preheminence?* 3. Ioh. 9. How many of that side haue receaved 500. or 600. pounds from their people, since their last Sermon, yea, since their last presence amongst them? Yea, are their not some that buy & sell benefices, as men buye and sell horses? Truely there are soe that being not old mē haue in their dayes passed through many benefices, and those of very good worth. To whō then doth this imputation of carnall respectes belong. Cease therefore, cease *M. Powell* to charge us with that against which there are so many reasons. Yea, wherein all the world can convince you.

329

They haue altered the state of the question. For the question being about subscription, Ceremonyes, Conformitie etc. (which are but thinges indifferent and of small moment) they make it the cause of God, the ministery of the gospell, the salvation of the people, the mayne cause of the land. G. Powel

How doe we alter the state of the qvestion? Doe we mince that which somtyme we held? Doe we goe from any thing which before we maynteyned? What ever was in controversie betwixt you and us, that is not comprehended under subscription, or some other of the particulars by you here mencioned? It is meere folly so often to repeate the indifferency of these thinges, that hath never been neither can be proved by you. For as much also as for not subscribyng, and for not conforming to Ceremonyes etc. Many more are thrust out of the ministery then for any other matter of ten tymes greater moment, may it not be truely called the cause of God? Especially it being in so many bookes proved that they are unlawfull & contrary to the word of God? Yea, sith for these thinges the word is restrayned, may we not say that the *salvation of the people dependeth therevpon?* And consequently *that it* *Answer*

is the mayne cause of the land? What is greater then salvation? Your selfe grant that we are Ministers of Christ, in grace and favour with God. It followeth therefore that our cause is the cause of God. *Luc.10.16.* Yea, of the land also, because besids salvation many other benefits doe depend upon the ministery of the word, and many evills vp on the restraint thereof. *Prov.29.18.* For this cause the Apostle joyneth these two togeather in the Iewes, *that they were contrary* (or adversaryes) *to all men, and forbad them to preach to the Gentles.* 1. Thessalonians 2. ver. 15.16.
Touching your often objection of our suspension and deprivation for not conformyng our selues, consider this one thing *M. Powell*, and consider it seriously, viz. that whē as *Iohn* and some other *Disciples* tooke upon them to forbid one casting out Devills, (that had before done it in the name of Christ) and that only because he would not joyne with them *and follow them to Christ:* and that afterward whē they made relation unto Christ, of that which they had done, and of the reason why they had done it (as though they had done some great service, as many thinke they doe now great service in forbidding us to preach) consider (I say agayne) that our *Saviour* was so far from approving that which they had done, that he rather reproved it saying, *Forbid him not.* Mar.9.38.39. Whether was a juster cause of suspention, not to joyne with such worthy Disciples of our Saviour, and that in following them, and goeing with them to our Saviour himselfe, or not to joyne with the Bishops, & to conforme our selues unto them in those things, wherein we are perswaded we should sinne against Christ, and in parte goe away from him? For we follow not Christ, neither walke with him any longer, then we doe obserue his word. Further also

con-

conſider whether is a greater, or at the leaſt a better and more neceſſary worke, to caſt out Devills from their poſſeſſion which they had of the bodyes of men, or to caſt them out from the ſpirituall poſſeſſion they haue of the ſoul of men, which eiection is wrought by the preaching the goſpell Acts 26.18. 331

They make this ſuch a cauſe, as if all religion depended on refuſing of a croſe and furplice etc. G. Powel

No, no. All religion and piety doth not depend on theſe thinges. Yet religion is the leſſe, and doth the more decay, the more that the preaching of the goſpell, for thes thinges is reſtrayned. The increaſe of ſinne and iniquity in thoſe places already where ſuch Miniſters are put out, doth too much teſtifie this thing. Heere againe is his former fallacy, as *eo quod eſt ſecundum quid, ad id quod eſt ſimpliciter*. We ſay, that ſome religion dependeth on refuſſing of a croſſe, ſurplice ete. Hence he concludeth, that all religion dependeth etc. Further, whether we make all religion to depend on refuſing a croſſe, ſurplice etc. or no, it ſemeth that the Biſhops make all religion (or the moſt) to depend on croſſe, ſurplice, etc. For if a man yeeld to theſe things, he may paſſe away with any other matter vn controlled: but if he ſtands in theſe things, then he is unworthy the miniſtery, whatſoever guiftes he haue, how godly ſoever he be, and what good ſo ever he haue done, or might doe by his continuance. Is it not ſo? Anſwer.

They boldly, preſumptuouſly, and unduetifully cenſure his Majeſtie for coldnes in religion, for loſing his firſt loue, deepe diſſembling, ſeeming to pretend one thing and to intend another as if he had been trayned up in the Ieſuits ſchooles to equivocat: which fault I would ſome of their faction did ſo litle practiſe, as his Majeſtie abhorres it. G. Powel

Wher is there any ſuch cenſure of his Majeſtie *for coldnes* Anſwer.

332 *nes in religion, for losing his first loue, and for deepe dissembling?* Nay, doth not the author expresly labour the quit contrary, professing that he wrote that which he did to this very end, that *men might not iudge Christian Princes vpon outward apperences*, yea adding *supposed apparences?* Yea, wishyng also *lesse censuring of them, and more praying for them?* Is there not by all authors a difference made betwixt *Simulare* and *di simulare*, that the one may be used in godly policy and christian wisdome, but that the other is alwayes *of the flesh fleshly?* In allegation of examples, every particular is not nicely and strictly to be respected, but that poynt onely is to be considered for which they are produced, and wherto they be applyed. Otherwise, from the application of *Davids eating of the shewe bread*, vnto the Disciples *plucking the eares of corne to eat*. Math. 12.3. A mã may gather that because *David* used lying as a meanes to obtayne the sheew bread at the Preists handes, therefore also it is lawfull for us by lying to obteyne some thing in our necessity. By the same reason also, because the midwiues of *Egypt* are commended to feare the Lord etc. *and to haue spared the male children of the Israelits*, the same fault of lying may be justified, because they being examined by *Pharoh* of that their doeing, excused themselues by a lye. The like may be saide of *Rahab*, commended for her faith in savyng the Israelits spyes, *Heb. 11.31.* Though she defended her selfe from the inquisitors of the King of *Iericho* by a lye. *Ios. 2.4.*

If the example of *Constantius* and *Iehu*, may for some things be excepted against, yet it might haue been considred, that the author to expresse his generall meanyng the better, did mention also the example of *Ioseph*, and of our *Saviour Christ Iesus*, against whom there can be no exception.

ception. And now to clere his meanyng the better, let the example of *Salomon* in that wherein he is ſo highly commended, be alſo remembred: who to try whither of the two weomen were the mother of the living child, commaunded *the lyving child to be divided in twane, and the one halfe to be given to the one woman, the other halfe to the other woman.* 1 Kings 3.25. Here is a manifeſt pretenſe of that which was not intēded. Let the anſwerer therfore learne, that there is great difference betwixt pretending onely for triall of the affections of other, and deepe diſſembling or *Ieſuitecall equivocating*, for the hiding or maynteyning of ſome impiety and wickednes. I doubt not therefore, but I may juſtifie the author from all ſuch thinges, as by allegation of the examples of *Conſtantius* & *Iehu*, are moſt uncharitably imputed unto him: yea, that alſo I may truely affirme his meanyng in them to haue been, onely to ſhew that he conceaved of his Majeſties meanyng, that which he was perſwaded to be beſt. Therfore farr was he from all undutifull conceits againſt his Majeſtie.

It is alſo to be obſerved, that he doth not abſolutly ſay this or that to be his Majeſties meanyng, but onely that it might be like to the meanyng of *Conſtantius*, *Iehu*, *Ioſeph*, and our *Saviour*: for ought that any man elſe did knowe. If it be otherwiſe, Gods will be done: and I hope that whatſoever ſome doe imagine of ſuch as are ſilenced and deprived, that upon ſight of his Majeſties full reſolution for the countenancyng and authorizyng of the Biſhops to hold on their courſe againſt us, then many will yeeld etc. yet it ſhall well appere that we haue not depended upon any other then upon God alone: and that that which we haue done, is not done vpon any vayne hope or expectation, but in conſcience of that word which is

334 our onely rule and canon whereby to liue, and whereby to dy. Touching the answerers wish that some of our faction (as he unbrotherly speaketh) *did so litle practise equiuocating as his Maiesty abhorres it*, either let him name such (if he know any) and let them beare their iniquity, or else let him spare such wishes, as whereby he implieth a secret accusation.

G. Powel. Whereas his Highnes heart is evidently discerned to be fully seasoned with true pitty etc.

Answer. Though flatery be odious, and the wages therof fearfull, yet if his Majestie or any other doe well consider the best fruites of a true heart, our loue and loyalty towards his Majestie should be found as good, as the best Prelats in the land.

G. Powel. It sufficeth me to haue detected the licence of their raving pēnes, the restraint of which fury, specially belongeth to your Honorable & judicious Court.

Answer. O *M. Powell* you doe to much forget modesty. Whither pen raveth most, yours or the authors, or whither he or you, (I will not say yee though you write by authoritie of some other) be in most fury, let that Honorable and judicious Court judge. Yea, if it might please his Majestie to vouchsafe the reading of the wrightings, and in his Princely wisedome to consider the dealing on both sides, we would not feare his Royall judgment concerning our cause or our selues. We feare the judgment of one Lordly Bishop ten times more, then the judgment of ten such religious Princes. For we assure our selues of more equitie from his Majestie, then we doe from all Lordly Bishops in the land.

G. Powel. Which your Honors will the rather performe, considering what unchristian conceits they haue of this Honorable assembly, and of all other his Majesties loving subjectes, who loyally obey him and serue God, according to the religion established: resembling them to *Constan-*

ſtantius his Nobles. Who became Idolaters and Atheiſtes upon his commaundement.

As before we haue ſeene how untruely the anſwerer maketh this note vpon the authors concluſion, with the letter e *an vniuſt calumni* pag 77. in as much as he hath accuſed the author before *of bold, preſumptuous, and undueti-full cenſuring of his Maieſtie etc.* thereby to provoke his Majeſties heavie indignation againſt us all, ſo now contrary to the ſame note, he accuſeth us alſo before the Nobles, yea, before all the ſtates of the whole kingdome. Doeht this man ſpare us, as he profeſſeth to doe in his ſecond note upon the 4 argument? Touching the matter here objected, it is partly anſwered before. The authors intent and purpoſe was only to perſwade all his Majeſties chriſtian ſubjectes to thinke Honorably of his Highnes, and not to judge him by outward ſuppoſed apparences. Ther was nothing to inſinuate any ſuch unchriſtian cenſure of this Honorable aſſembly and of other loving ſubjectes as this wranglinge anſwerer would wreſt from the authors words. The matters in queſtion concerne onely or ſpecially the miniſters of the word. The things alſo commaunded by his Majeſtie are nothing like to the thinges commaunded by Conſtantius. How injurous therefore it is, to conclude the ſame ſinne to be of them that obey his Majeſtie in the thinges now commaunded, that was in thoſe that obeyed *Conſtantius*, I leaue to the judgment of all reaſonable men. The fallacies of this collection, in reſpect of the difference both of thinges and alſo of perſons commaunded, I leaue to the ſentence of them that are as skilfull in *Ariſtotle* his *Elenchs*, as *M. Powell* ſeemeth to be. The childiſh accuſation of the author from the 8 Argument (heere inſerted either of mallice, or to encreaſe his

Answer.

Contrariety

volume) ſhall be diſcovered in the defence of that 8 Argument.

Concernyng the Arguments themſelues, may it pleaſe the Chriſtian reader firſt of all to take a generall veiwe of the generall fraudes of the anſwerer in his anſwer vnto them.

His firſt generall fraude is, that he ſetteth upon theſe Arguments, as though in them the mayne cauſe betwixt, the Prelats and vs were handled. Whereas the purpoſe of the author was not to informe the mindes and judgmẽts of the Parliament, but, taking that to be already done by other books written in that behalfe, & the rather becauſe he did already ſee them to deale in the cauſe; he labored altogether, to quicken their affections, and to whet and encreaſe their zeale to be the more earneſt in that cauſe, of the equity and ſinceritie whereof, by former bookes touching their iudgments they were abundantlie informed and perſwaded. And heerin he had the more reaſon to 'provoke their godlie zeale, in reſpect of the manifold & mightie adverſaries the cauſe had, and becauſe he knew that the ſayd adverſaryes wovld make ſtrong oppoſition therevnto and labor what they might to hinder the ſame.

2 Becauſe the mayne controverſie betwixt the Prelats and vs is not handled in theſe Arguments, therefore he inſulteth mightily, and often (almoſt in every page) he objecteth *petitionem principii* & begging of the queſtion vnto us, as though becauſe the controverſie were not handled in the ſayd arguments, therefore it were not handled elſe where. But ſith it is handled by other whoſe books & reaſons are not yet anſwered, neither ever will be ſubſtantially, therefore this is but a vayne boaſting.

His thyrd generall fraud is, that himſelfe committeth the

339

the ſame fault in all his anſwer, that he objecteth to the author of the arguments. For whereas the ſaid author vpon ſufficient proofe made of the cauſe by other bookes, doeth make this the generall concluſion of all the arguments, that it would pleaſe the whole State graciouſly to releeue the miniſters oppreſſed for that cauſe etc: this anſwerer maketh this his concluſion, that it would pleaſe the State to releeue the refractary and ſchiſmaticall Miniſters. So never prooving us, neither any other having ever proved us to be refractary, ſchiſmaticall etc. (except every Biſhop be a *Pythagoras*, and doe alwayes ſpeake oracles, which ~~they~~ ſeeldome doe) yet he taketh it for granted that we are ſuch. *Huic arenoſo fundamento tota ſtrues et moles ſequentis Prælatici reſponſi innititur. Vpon this ſandie foundation the whole frame and lumpe of all the Prelaticall anſwer following doth relye.*

M. POWEL TO THE TITLE OF THE Arguments.

All the Arguments following be common (excepting one or two) and may be urged for popery or any other hereſy etc. G. Powel

Are Popiſh or other hererical *Preiſts, miniſters of Chriſt, in grace and favor with Chriſt etc. Doe the Angels ſo long after, and reioyce in their Miniſtery as* in ours? Doe they as truely interprete *the myſteries of God to eternall life, as* Ioſeph interpreted *dreames for this life?* May they as truely be commended for the *ſpirituall deliverance of many ſoules, as* Ionathan *did worke the bodily deliverance of the Iſraelits? etc.* The like may be ſayd of the other arguments. How then are they ſo common as the anſwerer chargeth them to be? This beginnyng ſheweth, what we are to looke for in the reſt of the anſwer. Anſwer.

The firſt Argument.

The Ministers supplicated for, are evident to be the true Ministers of Christ. 1 By the speciall hatred of all wicked men against them: Iohn 15.19. *2 By their godly life. 3 By their gifts and by the blessing of God upon their labours.* Rom.10.15. 1 Cor.9.2. 2 Cor.3.2.3. *Therefore the State ought to releeue thē being now oppressed: because that which is done for them or denyed unto them, is done for Christ, or denyed unto Christ.* Exod.16 2.1 Sam.8.7.Luc.10.16.Math.25.40 Gal.3.25.Ephe.5.30.

THE MARGINALL NOTES OF M. POWEL upon the former Argument.

Gab. Powel a That is but justly omitted that makes nothing to the purpose.

Answ. The word gospell signifiyng the preaching of the gospell, the furtherance or hinderance therof maketh to purpose in this matter, or else nothing doth.

G. Powel b There be other Ministers of the gospell.

Answer. I acknowledge it with all thankes to God: and whatsoever difference of judgment or practise there be, betwixt them and us in the present controversie, yet I loue and reverence them for their giftes and paynes. But what then? Though there were ten times as many more, and every one as sufficient as the best, yet these tymes requyre all. Num.11.29. 2 Tim.4.1. 2 Tim.3.1.

The note with c I passe by. When they shew our proofes not to proue our intent, we will either strenghten them, or bring better.

G. Powel d Palpable ignorance. Many lay men, 1 are hated of the world. 2 lead an unblamable life. 3 haue sufficient gifts, ergo They are Ministers of Christ.

Double Sophistry. 1 Where as the author saith, those Ministers that are so hated of the world etc: are the Ministers of Christ, this answerer saith, they (not those Ministers) that are so qualified etc. 2 He leaveth altogether out the last poynt taken from the successe of their Ministery

Answer.

339

ſtery whoſe arte it is ſo to clip words, I neede not to note.

e They haue ill neighbours, that commend themſelues. But I could wiſh they were ſuch indeed. albeit they are generally noted to be great teachers and practiſers of vſury. G. Powel

Wee haue ſuch ill neightours that as by their dayly falſe accuſations and ſlaunders againſt us, doe urge us to pleade our owne innocency, as *Moſes*, *Samuell*, *Ieremy*, *Paule* and *Chriſt himſelfe*, having the like neighbovrs were vrged to juſtifie themſelues. Uſury cannot be ſo truely proved to be taught and practiſed by us, as all men ſee many conformitans to be uſurers, *Symoniſts*, *non reſidents*, *gameſters*, *potcompanions etc*. Yea, and to defend alſo ſome of theſe things. *Reply.*

f Why doe you not name them? G. Powel

It is needles. The namyng alſo of ſuch Prelats as haue commended thoſe whom they haue deprived, may perhaps purchaſe them as much ill will and hatred with their greater Prelats, as *Nicodemus* and ſome other had envy with the *Phariſes*, for ſpeaking any good word in behalfe of Chriſt. *Reply.*

g All this evidence can make but a conjecture, and that ſcarſe probable, ſeeing many heretikes, papiſts etc. Haue ſuffered more then all this comes to, for their hereſies and ſuperſtition. *Gab. Powel*

Thus may the ſuffering of all Martyrs be eluded. For heretikes have ſuffered as much. etc. But marke heere his cunnyng. The author ſpeaketh of ſuffering wrongs, indignities etc. *M. Powel* ſpeaketh of ſuffering more, leaving out the ſubſtantiue of the comparatiue adjectiue more. If he doe underſtand the former ſubſtantiue wrongs etc: then heretikes, Papiſts ſuffer not more. For they are worthy of whatſoever they ſuffer. If he vnderſtand an other ſubſtantiue, then he doth ſophiſticate, and equivocat. *Reply.* Sophiſtry

h As we envy not their giftes, ſo we commend their paynes: and

wish they had not put their hands to the plough and looked backe.

Reply. Such good words are litle worth, where there is such actuall unmercifulnes. *Iames 2. 16.* We looke not backe, but they that call themselues our Fathers, haue beaten & driven us from the plough, except we would wound our soules by sinnyng against Christ.

Gab. Powel i It seemes they favor the doctrine *de opere operantis*: especially waighing the latter part of this Pharisaicall comparison.

Reply. You know the contrary. *Paule* may as well be said to hold this doctrine as we: because he spake much more of his labors & of the blessing of God upon them, then we haue done or can doe. *2 Cor. 11. 23* The *Pharisaicall* comparison I leaue to them, that take upon them *Pharisaicall* authority.

G. Powel a They commend themselues to disgrace other. A lying and malicious censure.

Reply. To plead for sufficient Ministers that haue done good is not to disgrace other, but to haue all Churches the better provided for. Touching the ignorance, prophanes, irreligion, contention etc: of many places where there are conformable Miuisters either ignorant or idle, or scandolous, I would there were not too lamentable experience thereof. Wherfore Sir, put up agayne *your lying and malitious censure* into your owne sheath.

G. Powel b It is not their calling, but innovation & schisme that is blamed.

Reply. This is a jest, like as if a man should fall upon another & beate him that had an ague, and say, he beate not him, but his ague. Of innovation and schisme else where.

(c) and (d) I passe by as nothing worth.

G. Powel e As if the kingdome of heaven consisted in meat, drinke, or other outward things. Grosse impudency, or blind ignorance.

Reply. 1 The kingdome of heaven consisteth as well in the abuse of outward thinges, as in other matters. 2 The Prelats most offend in that which is heere objected: in that they put men from preaching the kingdome of heaven, that will not yeld to theire outward things. To reproche

vs with groſe impudency or blind ignorance beſeemeth not *M. Powell*, especially he ſuppoſing thoſe arguments to be written by conſent of all of our ſide: whereof ſome were preachers before he was borne,

f They ſpare ſpeech for Christ. Wherfore? *Becauſe the godly haue put on the Lord Ieſus.* A ridiculous concluſion. G. Powel

A litle thing will make him laugh, that will laugh at this concluſion. *They that haue put on Chriſt, are alſo his mẽbers, fleſh of his fleſh etc:* as likewiſe is expreſſed in the argument at large, but ſophiſtically omitted by the anſwerer: who were beſt to take heed he clip not the Kings coyne, as he clippeth mens words. If the godly be Chriſts members, doe not they ſpare ſpeech for Chriſt, that ſpare ſpech for the godly. Call not therefore ſuch concluſions ridiculous, but make you graver if you can. The laſt note where, when, by whom, being rediculous, I diſmiſſe with this merry anſwer, that the predicament *quando* is before *vbi*, and ſo is the ~~anſwer~~ *order* of the Bedles queſtions in *Cambridge. Solent quæri queſtiones, quando, vbi, ſub quo?* *Reply.*

THE FVRTHER ANSWER OF M. POWEL to the firſt Argument.

VVe grant the refractary Miniſters to be indeed the miniſters of Chriſt, neither is their calling brought into queſtion: yea we hope they are ſent by God, and in grace and favor with God: yet all their giftes and ſanctification being but in parte, they may be over ſeene in ſome thinges. G. Powel.

Heere is a manifeſt contrariety. He that is refractary cannot be ſuch a Miniſter of Chriſt. He that is in grace & favor with God, ought not to be diſgraced and moleſted by men. The later parte of the anſwer we never denyed. But are not the gifts and ſanctification of the Prelats alſo in part? May they not be, yea are they not in ſome things overſeene? *Reply.*

G. Powel It is true also properly in matters that belonging unto their ministery, not to speake for them etc. is to spare speech for God and Christ Iesus. But such are not the things in question. Viz. Crosse surplice, etc: which are laudable ceremoyes, commaunded for order and decency.

Reply. 1 As it is the duety of all to speake for common Christians not onely in matters properly belonging to christianity, but also in matters of their outward estate, peace, liberty, liffe, and things belonging to their life etc: so it is the duery of all Christians, not to speake onely for Ministers in matters only properly, and necessarily concerning their ministery, but also in other matters. The liberty also of preaching necessarily (though not properly) concerneth the ministery of the gospell (preachyng being the most principall parte of the sayd ministery) so also to preach without givyng offence to the weake, and with out disgrace to their ministery. For what hope can there be of comfortable succesſe where the ministery is joyned with offence or disgrace? These thinges are necessary though not proper: wherein the answerer committeth a great error; in confounding that that is necessary, with that that is proper. For many things may be necessary for every calling, which are not proper. Further for the whole ministery to be performed in all purity and sincerity, (as nigh as is possible) according to Gods word and practise of the Apostles, without inventions of men etc: this (I say) is also necessary (not proper) to the ministery, because by inventions of men, the ministery of the gospell is corrupted & weakened, even as mixture of water with wine so weakeneth the wine, that in time also it doth corrupt and decay. These thinges are supplicated for to the Parliament: If Crosse and surplice be laudable Ceremonyes, then when or where, the Sacraments are celebrated without them, there wanteth some laudable ceremonies.

This

This is abſurd and jmpious. What would further follow heerof I need not to write, we may here alſo noate his cũnyng, in that he ſaith not that theſe thinges are for order and decency: *but commaunded for order and decency*. Many men weare long hayre, and commaund their ſonnes to doe the like for *order and decencyes ſake*. In like reſpect many husbands command their wiues to paynt their faces, thus and thus to attire themſelues: Are theſe things therfore *orderly* and *decent*?

The Second Argument.

By the miniſtery of the goſpell the Angels of heaven receaue divine revelation to their further ioye etc. Exod.25.20. 1 Pet.1. 12. Epheſ.3.10. *Ergo To ſpeake for the miniſtery and miniſters of the goſpel, is to ſpeake for Angels etc.*

The marginall notes.

The firſt with (a) ſhalbe anſwerd afterward.

b What a conſequence is this? The Angels deſire to ſee into the ſecrets of our redemption, ergo. The miniſtery of the goſpell is prepared for them. G. Powel

Reply. Theſe words *into which things the Angels deſire to behold*, 1 Pet.1.12. muſt of neceſsity haue relation to the thinges before ſaid to be ſhewed *by them that had preached the goſpell*. For there is no other antecedent to the relatiue, *into which*. Therefore the conſequence is not to be ſo ſcorned by any that knoweth a conſequence. Heere alſo the anſwerer abuſeth his reader, by wrangling with the concluſion and leaving out the principall confirmation thereof, Epheſ. 3.10. Where it is expreſly ſayd, that *Paule* had receaved the miniſtery of the goſpell, to the intent that unto Principalityes and powers in the heavenly places now (not before in that manner) might be knowne by the Church (let that be alſo noted) the manifold wiſdome of

344 The other two notes touching ſchiſme and contention haue been anſwered, and ſhall afterwards be anſwered more fully: yet here I ad, that he doth unjuſtly heere ſay, *their contention.* For we contend not with them, but they with vs. We ſeeke to take nothing from them: they ſeeke and take all from us. *Abraham* for peace with *Lot* (his yonger, and nepheu) was cõtent to part from his owne right: but theſe are ſuch holdfaſts of their rites and ceremonies, that for peace with us, they will not part with an inch, though they get nothing by the whole. No marveill: for they will not parte with that which is the right onely of Chriſt. Let it be therefore here noted, how unfitly in the *title pag*, the anſwerer hath prefixed the ſentence of Abraham Gen: 13.18. *Let there be no contention etc.*

Further anſwer to the 2 Argument.

G. Powel This Argument is ambiguous and ſavors of a paradox. For how will they underſtand it? That Angels ſhould be miniſters of the goſpell? Impoſsible. Or that they ſhould be converted thereby etc? Abſurd: they never ſinned: or that they might learne to knowe the wiſdome of God? So they doe by all other creaturs, and actions of God:

Reply. No paradox at all. Neither had the anſwerer any cauſe to make the two firſt queſtions, if he had conſidered the places alleadged. That which he oppoſeth to the third againſt knowledge of the wiſdome of God by the goſpell etc: may as well be oppoſed to mens knowledge of the wiſdome of God by his word. For they are alſo taught the wiſdome of God by his creatures and works. *pſa.19.1 Rom.1.1920.* The further meanyng of this argument, in any ſpeciall manner differing from other, I leaue to the author himſelfe: who is able (no doubt) to defend his meanyng, or ready to yeeld better reaſon to the contrary. But be it, that he had no other meanyng in this poynt then other men haue, yet the common doctrin of the ſcriptures tou-

345

touching Angels in this behalfe, maketh the argument good. For the Angels of themſelues, know not who be elect, and who be reprobat. This knowledge before calling is proper to the Lord. 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. The election of men is made knowne to the Angels, by their calling and converſion, wherein it is ſayd the Angels rejoyce *Luc.* 15. 7. & 10. And ſo accordingly they glorifie God, in glorifiyng of whom conſiſteth their happines. The more therefore the word is preached, and men converted thereby, the more the Angels reioyce, and glorifie God: the leſſe the word is preached, the leſſe they rejoyce: yea, they may be ſayd in ſome ſort the more to mourne. In this reſpect therfore, the goſpell may be ſaid to be for the Angels. So this great paradox is unfolded. The ſubſtance of the ſecond parte of this anſwer to this 2 Argument hath been anſwered before. Whereas he chargeth us *to forſake our miniſtery for a fewe pety accidentall circumſtances*; therein he diſcovereth the nakednes of the Prelats, in inflicting ſo materiall and ſubſtantiall puniſhment, for a few pety accidentall circūſtances. For juſtice requyreth a proportion betwixt the offence and the puniſhment. But we acknowledg no offence. For we may not purchaſe liberty of doing the greateſt good, with committing the leaſt evill. He that ſaith doe good, firſt ſaith, *eſchew evill*. pſal. 34. 14. Theſe thinges being alſo proved evill in other bookes, they are not to be accounted pety and accidentall circumſtances. The leaſt ſinne againſt the great God, is to be accounted a great matter.

In his third anſwer he proclameth agayne, but proveth not our error and faction. If we erre or be factious, let us in that reſpect be puniſhed (ſo notwithſtāding that the people be not puniſhed with us) and let us be holpen

as we are Miniſters.

G. Powel

It doth not follow, that if the wiſe and judicious Parliament, ſhould iuſtly refuſe to deale in the cauſe of Schiſmaticall Miniſters, further thē only to admoniſh them to deſiſt from their ſingularity, etc: therefore they ſhould provoke God and Angels. Yea, if they ſhould take parte with Schiſmatikes, and intercede for them, to deteyne them and the people ſtill in faction, thē they ſhould provoke God, etc. pſa: 50: 1718

Reply.

Indeede now you ſpeake ſure: and if alwayes you ſpeak ſo, you ſhall not be trapt. If the Parliament *iuſtly refuſe etc. and if we be ſchiſmatiks and ſingular etc.* then all is well on your ſide: But when will you proue us ſuch? As I ſhall anone proue the contrary, ſo in the meane tyme for ſingularity, it belongeth not to us, but to the Prelats, that are ſingular by themſelues, differing from the word, and from more Churches reformed then we; both in judgment & alſo in practiſe. But to returne to your other words, thus I reaſon from them againſt you. *The wiſe and iudicious Parliament will not intermedle in the quarrell of Sdhiſmaticall miniſters further then onely to admoniſh them to deſiſt from their ſingularity etc:* all theſe are your owne words.

But the Parliament hath further intermedled for vs etc. ergo. We are not ſchiſmaticall. Either therefore recant your commendation of the Parliament, or elſe revoke yous reprochfull accuſing vs to be ſchiſmatikes. *Vtrum horum mauis accipe.* I ſuppoſe you will not charge the Parliament, with any thing contrary to the commendation you haue before geiven of them; and which all wiſe and judicious men will acknowledge to be due vnto them. Therfore I hope you will *de nobis palinodiam canere*, and never heerafter charge vs as you haue done.

Here is one thing more to be noated as ſome what croſſing my former ſuppoſall, for not revoking his former cōmendation of the Parliament, yea, & making me to feare that

that he will rather impute folly to them (according to the manner of ſome other Prelats) then revoke his reproches againſt vs. What is this that is to be noted? viz. That to proue, if they ſhould take parte with vs, then they ſhould provoke God and the whole hoſt of heaven againſt us, that (I ſay) to proue this, he applyeth unto them, pſal. 50. 17.18. Whereby he inſinuateth, *that they having interceded for us, doe* therefore *hate to be reformed, haue caſt Gods word behind them, haue runne with theeues, and taken part with adulterers.* For theſe are the expreſſe words of the pſalme, which he applyeth to the Parliament for dealing in our behalfe: ſo indeede accuſing us as the principall offenders in thoſe ſinnes, that are mencioned in that pſalme, but yet making the Parliament alſo acceſſary with us in them.

THE THIRD ARGVMENT.

It was a fault in Pharaoh his butler, that he did no ſooner remember to ſpeake to Pharoah for the libertie of Ioſeph, *and for his releaſe from his affliction.* Gen. 40.14. & 23. *Seeing* Ioſeph *had interpreted his dreame of reconciliation to the grace of* Pharaoh, *and to his former place of earthly honorable ſervice in the houſe of* Pharao. Ergo

The Parliament ought ſo to remember the interpretation of the myſteries of God his favor and heavenly kingdome by the miniſters now ſilenced: etc. That they doe what lawfully they may, to releaſe them of their troubles.

1 Marginall notes.

a This and moſt of the arguments following are grounded upon a falſe principle, viz: that the refractary Miniſters quarrell againſt the Church of England, is the miniſtery of the goſpell, the ſalvation of the people etc: wheras indeed all the contention is about croſſe, ſurplice, and ſome other indifferent Ceremonyes, and actions in the Church. And all theſe arguments doe ſpecially make againſt them, ſeeing they be onely diſturbers of the ſincere profeſſion of the goſpell, and worke G. Powel

of the miniſtery: yea ſeeing they forſake their calling, and moue ſo great contention.

G. Powel And agayne.

b would God they were halfe ſo diligent in a good cauſe, as they are importunat to ſow ſchiſme and ſedition among brethren. But they deſerue ſmall commendation etc.

Reply. One reply ſhall ſerue to both theſe notes. Eſpecially becauſe (as it is noted before) all the anſwer is grounded upon a falſe principle, *that we are ſchiſmatiks etc.* and ſo worthy of all that hath been done unto us. To inſiſt therefore upon this poynt, I ſay firſt of all, that this accuſation of vs to be ſuch, is a moſt beggerly begging of the queſtion, moſt unjuſt, untrue, and uncharitable, never yet proved, neither able to be proved, vntill they proue the matters in controverſie, to be meerely indifferent to ſuch uſes, as whereto they are imployed & urged by them, yea, good and laudable Ceremonies, matters of decency, and order in the Church: yea, that we alſo refuſe to conforme our ſelues unto them, more of ſtomacke, then of conſcience. Much leſſe can they juſtifie their proceedings againſt & and puniſhing of us: yea not onely of us, but alſo of our people (a thing moſt unrighteous and odious to God & men) in ſuch manner as they haue done, eſpecially more for theſe things (which themſelues call indifferent, ſmall, pettie, accidentall, circumſtantiall) then they doe other, for things expreſly forbidden by God himſelfe, & a thouſand tymes more offenſiue to other, and more reprochful and diſgracefull to our Church, profeſſion, and kingdom then theſe things. Yea it is to be obſerved, that notwithſtanding all theſe proceedinges againſt us, all our bookes written againſt the ceremonyes, (onely to ſhew the righteouſnes of our cauſe) and all their writtyngs againſt us,

none

none of them haue ever yet, either in open consistory, or in privat conference (that I haue heard of) or in publike writing, made any one, (no not one) demonstratiue reason, necessarily concluding the lawfulnes, and the good and necessary use, of the things they so heavily impose vp pon us. Some indeed haue written against some of our arguments, but no otherwise, then the witt of man may cavill against any principle of religion, though never so substantially proved by the best divine upon the earth. 349

But to returne to the poynt, there is nothing in these two notes and in the rest of the booke objected against vs, where with our auncients and betters, haue not been charged in former tymes. *Elia* was charged with troubling *Israell*. 1 *King*. 18. 17. *Michaiah* might haue been charged with singularity and schisme, for dissenting from all the 400 Prophets in *Ahabs* time. 1 *King* 22. *Ieremy* was accused by the *Preists and Prophets* of his tyme, to haue spoken *against* the state of *the City, and to be therefore worthy to dye. Ierem. 26. 11. Amos* was charged *by Amazia the preist, with such conspiracy against the King, that the land was not able to beare all his words*. Amos 7. 10. All the Iewes was generally accused *by Haman to Ahashueroth, not to haue observed the Kings lawes*. Ester 3. 8. *Ezra and the Iewes with him*, were accused by *Rehum, Shimshay*, and other beyond the river to *Artashasht* the King, *as rebellious and wicked for building of Ieruſalem:* Yea, they were not only so accused for the time present, but also for the time to come, (as we are afterward in the 16 Argument in the marginall note with (r) that if they were suffered to proceed in building of the City, *they would not pay toll, nor tribute: nor custome*, yea, *Ezra* and his companions were not onely charged to be such, but the whole City of *Ieruſalem* for former

Our betters heretofore charged as we are now.

350 tymes was alſo charged to haue been a *rebellious & noyſom City vnto Kings and Prouinces, that the inhabitants therof had moued ſedition of old time, & that for that cauſe, that Citie had been deſtroyed.* Therefore alſo the ſayd *Rehum* and *Shimshay* and their companions, pretended *regard of the Kings Honor, in writing ſo againſt Ezra and the reſt of the Iewes*, Ezra 4.12.etc. The enimyes of *Daniell* framed the like accuſation of him to *Darius*, Daniell 6. Our Saviour himſelfe was blaſphemed by the name of a *ſeducer & deceiver of the people. Ioh. 7.12.* Yea oft tymes *as a blaſphemer, profaner of the Saboth, a frend to publicans and ſinners. Paule* was accuſed to haue *taught men againſt the law and the Temple.* Acts 21.28. and to *be a peſtilent fellow, a mover of ſedicion.* Acts 24.5. yea to be an heretike verſe 14.

Such alſo haue been the accuſations of all Martyrs by the common adverſaries the Papiſtes. It is therefore the more to be marveilled at, that our Prelats (profeſſing, and ſometime preaching the goſpell) doe accuſe vs in like manner. Yea, charge *us to diſturbe the ſincere profeſſion of the goſpell, and worke of the miniſtery*, and yet alleadge no reaſon heerof: or at leaſt no other reaſon then ſuch as for which all or the moſt part of thoſe before named, were ſo charged as we haue heard. For beſides traditions of men, antiquity (not proved, at leaſt not true antiquity) the commaundements of Princes (procured by themſelues, uncharitably miſinformyng ſuch princes) beſids thes things (I ſay) what elſe haue they ſaid, doe they ſay, or can they ſay?

The Miniſters, not yelding to conformitie, are no ſchimaticks.

Doe we vary from the ſincere doctrine of the ſcriptures? Nay, rather many of them doe much more ſwarue from the ſame: eſpecially ſithens their late ſtrong patronizing and urging of theſe things: yea, they haue fallen frō

that

that that heertofore hath been conſtantly, and generally held by our Church now teaching theſe thinges, which haue been accounted and are in truth, popiſh, or *Lutheran* errors: viz: touching generall grace, & the death of Chriſt for every particular perſon: againſt perticular election & reprobation: for images in Churches, both for remembrance of hiſtory and alſo for devotion: touching the mā ner of Chriſts preſence in the ſupper of the Lord: That the Pope is not the Antichriſt, which is the next ſtep to ſay, that he is Chriſts vicar, & wherby they hinder (what they may) the zeale of Chriſtian Princes from executing that againſt him in generall, and againſt his members in perticular, which the word partly foretelleth, and partely commaundeth to be done: concernnyng alſo the neceſsity of Baptiſme: touching auricular confeſsion: for ignorance (according to the popiſh ſaying, *that ignorance is the mother of devotion*) that it is not neceſſary for the people to haue much knowledge, and that therefore not much preaching, but that it is ſufficiēt, if they can ſay the Lords prayer, the ten cōmaundements, and the articles of faith: which is directly contrary to the ſcriptures. *Ioh. 6. 69. Ephe 4. 13. Philip. 1. 9. & 3. 7. 8. Coloſ. 3. 16. Epheſ. 5. 17. 2 Pet. 3. 18.* Who can lay any ſuch poyntes to us, or to any of vs? This poynt is not lightly to be regarded: yea, it is of great moment. For the Apoſtle deſcribeth ſchiſmatikes, not to be ſuch, *as make diviſion onely*, but he addeth, *contrary to the doctrine which they had learned*. Rom. 16. 17. Yea in the very next verſe he deſcribeth them further, ſaying, *They that are ſuch ſerue not the Lord Ieſus Chriſt, but their owne bellyes, and with faire ſpeeches, and flattering, diceaue the hearts of the ſimple*. Doe we ſo? Nay rather we labour onely for the ordinances, which the Apoſtle hath taught vs. In this re-

351

Exceter

352 ſpect we *ſerue not our owne bellyes*, but rather for thoſe ordinances ſake, and to ſerue the Lord Ieſus by them, and according unto them, we depriue our owne bellyes of that which otherwiſe they might haue; neither *doe we vſe faire ſpeeches, and flattering, but by playne dealing* for thoſe ordinances of Chriſt Ieſus, we procure the diſpleaſure of all men againſt us. As therefore this place maketh for vs, and evidently ſheweth vs to be no ſchiſmatikes, ſo likewiſe it doth as plainely proue them to be ſchiſmatikes that *make diviſion* for humane inventions, either in doctrine, or otherwiſe in practiſe in the worſhip of God, contrary to thoſe things which they haue learned from the Apoſtle; who alſo therein, *ſerue not the Lord Ieſus, but their owne bellyes, vſing faire wordes and flattering* in that behalfe *to deceiue* not onely *the ſimple*, but alſo if it be poſſible, them that are wiſe.

Agayne haue we made any departure from the Church? We are deprived of our Miniſtery, and ſo thruſt out of our lyvinges, perforce againſt our wills, as any man leaveth that which is violently taken a way: but though we be thus put from our miniſtery and lyvinges by our Prelats, yet we do not forſake the cõmunion of the Church. The cauſe alſo why we are put out, is not for reſpect of our ſelues, but for feare of ſinnyng againſt God, and of aggravating the burden of our owne conſcience therby. *We diſturb not the ſincere profeſſion of the goſpell, and worke of the miniſtery*, but in all humilitie, and with the wordes of ſobriety, we condemne the corruptions of our profeſſion and of the miniſtery, moſt duetifully and by all lawfull meanes (and no other) deſiring both to be reformed, according to Gods word. So in like manner we deſire to be eaſed of thoſe cloggs, which hinder both us in the

worke

353

worke of the miniſtery, and alſo the people ſo, that they neither doe, neither can ſo edifie themſelues in their moſt holy faith, as otherwiſe they and we would doe. On the contrary, the Prelats ſtoutly mayntaine and ſupport the ſayd corruptions, and in loue of them (or rather of ſome other matter depending upon them) they hate and moleſt us.

Agayne haue we loytred in the worke of the miniſtery? Haue we heaped benefice upon benefice? Haue we eatē and drunke, and beaten our fellow ſervants? Haue we ſought our owne, & not that which is Ieſus Chriſts? *Phil. 2.21. Haue we made our bellyes our God? Haue we minded earthly things?* philip. 3.19. I ſpeake not theſe things boaſtingly (as before we haue been charged) but onely to purge our ſelues of thoſe crimes, which the former two notes did caſt upon us, and to proue that we haue not been diſturbers but furtheres of the ſincere profeſſion of the goſpell, and worke of the Miniſtery. Therfore let them that do ſo vntruely accuſe us, take heed that he (whoſe checke no fleeſh ſhall be able to indure) doe not charge them, rather *to haue taken away the key of knowledge, and to haue shut vp the Kingdome of heaven before men, not goeyng in themſelues, neither ſuffering them that would enter, to come in. Mat. 23.13.* whereas alſo the word *Schiſme* in the Greeke language ſignifieth a renting, and the word *ſedition* in the latine tongue ſignifieth *ſeorſim ire*, to goe a ſide or, a going aſide: as we haue proued that in theſe ſignifications, we cannot be juſtly charged with them, ſo let them that doe charge vs in this behalfe ſee and conſider well, whether themſelues may not more truely be ſayde to haue rent themſelues, and to haue gone a ſide, firſt from the word (the rule of all Churches) in the poyntes of doctrine before

354 mentioned, and in ſome other, as alſo in the obſerving & maynteyning of humaine Ceremonyes in the worſhip of God: 2 From other Churches of Chriſt Ieſus: both the auncient Apoſtolicall Churches, and alſo the preſent Churches reformed in other Coũtryes: nether of which either held or doe hold ſuch poynts of doctrine as before I haue named: or haue or doe obſerue & maintayne ſuch humaine Ceremonyes in the worſhip of God, as are here in queſtion. We beyng charged with hereſye & ſchiſme by the Papiſts for renouncyng the doctrine and communion of the preſent Romiſh Synagogue, doe truely returne the ſame charge upon the papiſts touching heriſie and ſchiſme, becauſe they haue fallen away from the doctrine and auncient ſimplicitie in the worſhip of God, that at the beginnynge was in the Auncient Romane Church, and in other true Churches, planted by the Apoſtles. In like mannner therefore let our accuſers in the feare of God conſider, whither the blame of ſchiſme doe not for the cauſes before expreſſed, more aptly belonge unto them, then to vs etc.

Let me yet alſo (though ſomewhat perhaps out of place) ad one reaſon more, to proue the Miniſters pleaded for, not to be Schiſmatikes.

All Schiſmatikes are abomination to the Lord: The Miniſters pleaded for: are not abomination to the Lord, but in grace and favour with him, *Ergo*: The Miniſters pleaded for, are no Schiſmatikes. The propoſition or firſt parte of the Argument, is *Salomons*, who among the ſixe thinges which the Lord hateth, and the ſeven which the ſoule of the Lord abhorreth, he reckoneth *him that rayſeth up contention among brethren*. The aſſumptiõ or ſecond part of the former Argument is granted by the anſwerer him-

anſwerer himſelfe in his anſwer to the firſt Argument: yea it is manifeſt by the good ſucceſſe of their miniſtery from God in the ſayd Argument mentioned. Yea, and that this argument from the bleſsing of God upon their miniſtery, is of force,and much to be reſpected, appereth by the words of the blind man reported with commendation by *S. Iohn. This is a mervelous thing that ye know not whence he is, and yet he hath opened myne eyes. Now we know that God heareth not ſinners; but if any man be a worſhipper of God,and doth his will,him heareth he.* And verſe 33. *If this mā were not of God,he could haue done nothing.* Was this argumēt good from the opennyng of the eyes of the body of one that was borne bodily blind,and is it not much ſtronger: from the openyng of the eyes of the minde of many that are borne ſpiritually blind?

The further anſwer of *M. Powel* to this third Argument conteyneth nothing, but that which is partely anſwered before,and partly to be anſwered afterward. Therefore I paſſe the ſame by and come to the 4 argument.

The Fourth Argument.

The Iſraelits ſo reſpected a bodily deliverance wrought by Ionathan *for them,that they ſaved him from danger of death.* Ergo *Much more ought this Chriſtian high Court of Parliament,(being not a company of rude ſouldiers, but the cheife flower of this Realme,and repreſenting the whole Realme) ſo to reſpect the ſpirituall deliverance of themſelues and of many other,wrought by the Miniſters now ſilenced etc. That they ſpeake what lawfully they may for all lawfull releeſe of them againſt their troubles.*

The marginall notes.

a *Ionathans* caſe and the Schiſmaticall Miniſters is altogether unlike. And the urging of this zeale, having not the like cauſe,ſeemes to be dangerons. But I ſpare my brethren. G.Powel.

356

The author urgeth not this argument from *Ionathan* as from a like example, but from a compariſon a *minore ad maius, from the leſſe to the greater.* Therefore though there be not the like cauſe, yet there being greater, viz. From conſideration of a ſpirituall deliverance there is no danger therin. The author by this example moveth only the Parliament to be zealous for the ſaide Miniſters, Is there danger now in the zeale, of ſo wiſe & judicious an aſſembly? It is alſo acknowledged by the anſwerer afterward, that the *Iſraelits* did juſtly reſcue *Ionathan*. Is there any danger then by an example of them that did juſtly, to provoke the wiſe Parliament, to pleade with a wiſe and religious Prince for the Miniſters. Wherin then doth this anſwerer ſpare vs, that ſeeketh every corner, to find ſome thing for which he might (if he could) hang us?

G. Powel b The greater is their ſinne, whoſe ſuperſtition, and wilfull obſtinacy hath reſtrained their libertie, and made them unſerviceable in the Church.

Reply. Is it not a ſtrange thing (I had almoſt ſaide, ſinne) that it ſhould be accounted *ſinne, ſuperſtition, and wilfull obſtinacy*, yea, ſuch as makes men *vnſerviceable in the Church*, (in feare of ſinnyng againſt God) ſoberly to refrayne from humane Ceremonyes, and yet ſwearing, ſwaggering, rioting, gamyng, dronkennes, whoredome, adultry, (even in the ſight of the world) ſhould not make men unſerviceable etc? That ſuch things are, in many ſuffred and countenaunced in the miniſtry, is knowne to many of the Parliament houſe. If his Chriſtian Majeſtie were alſo rightly informed thereof, I doubt not but that thinges would be otherwiſe ordered.

Further anſwer to the 4 Argument.

The Miniſters did but their duety etc.

If

357

If men ſhould alwayes be ſo anſwered, when in their neceſsities they ſhould require ſome help and comfort, in regard of ſome former kindnes; would not men cõdemne ſuch anſwerers of great ingratitude & in humanitie? viz. Thus to be anſwered, that which you haue done was but your duety?

Ionathans example is unlike unto the ſuppliants. For *Saule* in hypocriſy had made a raſh vowe etc. But the actions of our Soveraigne are not ſo exorbitant, etc: but adviſed and juſt etc. G. Powel

See how wiſe the children of this world are in their kind? The author altogether wiſely and purpoſely (as it ſeemeth) concealed the name of *Saule* in the argument; that he might reaſon from the compariſon of the worke onely of *Ionathan* in a bodily deliverance, for the better regard of the Miniſters now ſilenced etc. In reſpect of the ſpirituall deliverance of the people by them. This (I ſay) he doth without any mention at all of *Saule*, that ſo the worke might be generally and ſimply reſpected in it ſelfe; without any perticular eye unto *Saule*, out of whoſe hãds the people delivered *Ionathan*. He reſpected their thankefulnes in delivering *Ionathan* from death, without reſpect of the perſon that would haue put him to death. *Reply.*

Agayne, I know not why the anſwerer ſhould thinke the author to meane rather our gracious King as anſwerable to *Saule*, then the Prelats, the cheife and principall actors, in all wrongs and injuries done unto the Miniſters pleaded for: except that either he had rather impute all hard dealing to his Majeſtie than to the Prelats: or that hereby he would provoke the more wrath, againſt the author and all by him ſupplicated for, whom before not withſtanding he ſeemed greatly to ſpare. Further if the Iſraelits juſtly reſcued *Ionathan* as the anſwerer confeſſeth *they did iuſtly*) much more iuſt is it, that many miniſters

358

ſhould be releeved in their troubles. If yet they preſſe the author further for meanyng *Saule*, and comparing our King unto him (as *Saule* was the Lords annoynted) what is the danger, wherein the anſwerer before ſhould bragge of ſparing his brethren? Can he gather any undutifulnes towards his Majeſtie? Or can he imagine, the author to haue intended any forcible meanes to be uſed by the Parliament, that ſitting to make lawes againſt force and violence towardes any ſubject, muſt therefore much more themſelues be farre from offering any force and violence towards their Soveraigne? Doe the words in the Argument (*to be Zealous and earneſt*) import any ſuch matter? Force and violence of any, eſpecially of ſubjects againſt their Princes, is rather of Popiſh fury and madnes, then of any Chriſtian zeale and earneſtnes. Beſides, the often moſt Honorable mention of his Majeſtie in the Arguments, and his expreſſe presſing the Parliament to doe all in humility & modeſtie, (in the next argument) yea, that they ſhould not onely uſe boldnes, but chriſtian boldnes, yea, that they ſhould *put forth all their giftes and graces, of knowledge, Zeale, compaſſion, modeſty and humility*: yea, finally, that in the preface he petitioneth, nothing by him written, *to be underſtood of any other meanes, then good, honeſt, lawfull, peaceable, and agreable to every mans calling*; All theſe things doe abundantly cleere the author from all undnetifull intent and meanyng againſt his Majeſtie. That the Iſraelits did not in ſuch humility ſpeake for *Ionathan* to *Saule* as they ſhould haue done, in regard that *Saule* was the Lords annoynted; this is not ſo much to be reſpected, as the conſideration and reaſon, why they reſcued *Ionathan*. Neither is the Argument, by that wherein they fayled any thing weakened, but rather the more ſtrenghtened. For

if

359

if they ſo reſpected a bodily deliverance wrought by *Ionathan*, that they paſſed the bounds of their duty; ſhould not the regard of a ſpirituall deliverance, moue ſuch a chriſtian aſſembly to ſpeake what lawfully they may, with all modeſty and humility.

THE FITH ARGVMENT.

Nehemiah *ſpake to an heathen King for the materiall Ieruſalem. So did* Heſter *to the like King for her people, and that not without great danger to her ſelfe.* Ioſeph *alſo of* Arimathea *and* Nicodemus, *(both timorous men) ſpake boldly to* Pilate, *(an heathen alſo) for the body of Chriſt beyng dead, that they might honorably bury it: yea this they two did, when all the Diſciples of Chriſt had forſaken him, as alſo when his enimyes had prevailed againſt him. Yet all theſe had good ſucceſſe in that for which they ſpake.* Ergo *Much more ought this High Court of Parliament, to ſpeake to a Chriſtian and religious King, for the building of the ſpirituall Ieruſalem, for the ſpirituall ſtate and furthering of the ſoules of many depending upon the Miniſters now moleſted, and for whole Chriſt Ieſus now living and raignyng.*

Marginall notes.

a Impertinent example. G. Powel *Reply.*

This note is impertinent, as ſhall appeare by his anſwer afterward, and the reply therunto.

b A foule beggyng of the queſtion, as if the ſchiſme of a few, were ſo juſt and important a matter, as the delivery of the whole Church, from intended certeyne deſtruction. G. Powel *Reply.*

The ſubſtance of this note (touching ſchiſme) being like the ſong of the *Aprill bird* that hath but one note, I haue often anſwered. Though we were ſuch Schiſmatiks as the anſwerer chargeth us to be, yet we ought to haue that benefite of law which Paule claimed even in *Nero* his time, and was not denyed it. *Acts 25.12.*

G. Powel c These pure Angels of light thinke all the world in darknes, beſides themſelues.

Theſe ſcoffes can hardly come from a pure mind, but doe rather beſeeme prophane Angels ofdarknes, then the children of light: much leſſe the Preachers of holines.

Reply. Whether we that are depriued and ſilenced, are fitter for the worke of the miniſtery, then 5000. in the land that ſtand for miniſters, and receaue the wages of Miniſters; I will not ſay, *let the whole High Court of Parliament iudge*, but, let many of the Prelats and other conformitans judg.

G. Powel d An impudent untruth of a falſe Prophet. They made themſelues uncapable of any place in the miniſtery.

Reply. Let all thoſe that charge us with impudency, and making our ſelues uncapable of the miniſtery, take heed that one day, *they be not aſhamed before the Sonne of God at his cõmyug: and that then alſo the Sonne of God be not aſhamed of them, before his Father and his holy Angels*, and ſo pronoũce them uncapable of the kingdome of heaven; yea, leaſt alſo *the maſter of ſuch a ſervant come in an houre, that he is not ware of, cut him of, and giue him his portion with hypocrites.* Mat. 24. 50.51. Michael *the Archangell durſt not blame the Devill with curſed ſpeaking, but ſayd, the Lord rebuke thee.* Iud. 9. You know what is written by an orator, of an orator. *Ex eius ore, verba magno impetu atque æſtu erumpebant, non ſecus ac feruentes aque ebulliunt et exiliunt.* That which is ſayd of his words, may be ſayd of the reproches, raylings, ſcoffings etc: of this notary. But are we falſe Prophets? *Falſe Prophets runne before they are ſent. They ſpeake out of their owne hearts, they follow their owne ſpirit, and haue ſeene nothing.* Eze 13.2.3. Ierem. 14.14. *They flatter, & heale the hurt of Gods people with ſweete wordes, ſaying, Peace, peace, where there is no peace.* Ierem. 8.11. They are hypocrits, pretending great holi-

361

holines, commyng in ſheeps apparell, but being inwardly ravenyng wolues. Math. 7.15. *They are covetous and cruell like a roaring Lion, ravenyng the pray, devouring ſoules; taking riches and precious things etc:* Ezech. 22.25. They are proud and ambitious, *loving the prayſe of men, more then the prayſe of God.*

Can we be charged with theſe thinges? Hath not the Lord ſent us? Doe we ſpeake any thing but that the Lord hath put into our mouthes? Our flattery conſiſteth in playne reprehending of ſinne, and denouncyng the judgment of God againſt the ſame. Our covetouſnes is inſpendyng all we haue, and leaving nothing to our poſteritie. Our cruelty is in ſuffering the manifold injuryes that are done unto us. Our hypocriſie is in a care of keeping a good conſcience. Our ambition is in the abaſing of our ſelues, beneath the parentage and education of many of us: and in bearing the ſcornes & reproches of the world, yea, in beyng accoumpted the skumme of the world, and contemned by ſome, that haue been glad of the cruſtes that haue come from ſome of our tables. Why then doth this Notary call the author of thoſe Arguments, or any other by him pleaded for in his Arguments, by this odious name of *a falſe Prophet*? If the Lord rebuke him for ſo calling us, I pray that it may not be in anger. Touching our *in capacitie* of any place in the miniſtery, wherfore are we ſo incapable? What be our errours in doctrine? What are our vices in life? Is conformity the cheife and moſt cardinall virtue? Is it the ſoule of a miniſter, *tota in toto, et tota in qualibet parte*? Muſt all learnyng, all piety, all gravity, all ſoundnes giue place to conformity? So it ſeemeth. For learned men, godly men, graue men, and ſound Divines (I ſpeake not of my ſelfe, I confeſſe my

ſelfe

362

ſelfe the meaneſt of many hundreds) ſuch men (I ſay) are thruſt out, and ignorant men, wicked men, young men, corrupt and Popiſh men, are put into the ſervice of the Church. May we not ſay, *Plead thou our cauſe O Lord etc?* pſal. 35.1. Yea rather may we not ſay, *Ariſe O Lord, maynteyne thine owne cauſe: remember thy dayly reproches by the foolish man.* pſal. 74.22.

G. Powel e They meane their Preſbyterie.

Reply. This is but a ſcoff and mocke. But though we be mocked, yet let this mocker remember, that *God is not mocked.* The author ſpeaketh expreſly of the miniſtery of the goſpell which is for inſtruction, this Notary ſaith, he meaneth thereby, their Presbytery, which is for goverment. But more of this afterward.

G. Powel f Note this, They would haue all the Biſhops removed & deprived.

Reply. Doe you gather this, becauſe mention is made of removyng of the lets and impediments of the *ſincere miniſtery of the goſpell?* Then it ſeemeth that either you would haue a ſharpe phiſitian for the caſting of waters, ſith you can ſee ſuch inviſible things in a mans words, or elſe that your owne conſcience told you that the Biſhops are great lets and impediments *to the ſincere miniſtery of the goſpell.* If you be of that minde and ſhew the ſame, it wilbe no ſmall let and impediment to your owne preferment with the Biſhops, If you be not, then ſurely this your note is not worth the noting.

G. Powel g If we profeſſe Chriſt and maintayne his goſpell, what doe they plead for then? Wherefore haue they denyed it all this while, pretending they labour for nothing but the goſpell, & the miniſtery therof?

Reply. What an untruth is this? Where haue we denyed Chriſt here to be profeſſed, and his goſpell maynteyned? But though we profeſſe Chriſt & maynteyne his goſpell, yet we plead, 1 for the better continuance of the goſpell

where

where already it is: 2 That ſo it may the better be where it is not: 3 That it may be more glorified, and the better floriſh and fructifie in all places: all which thinges cannot be, if the proceedinges begunne be not ſtayd and mitigated. 4 May not a kingdome in generall profeſſe Chriſt and maynteyne his goſpell, and yet haue ſome ſuperfluityes, which obſcure Chriſt and hinder his goſpell; as alſo want ſome thinges belonging to Chriſt and his goſpell, which may make Chriſt more glorious, and further his Goſpell?

h Lo: now the Diſciplinariay ataxie, for which the ſuppliants plead ſo much, is whole Chriſt Ieſus. Intollerable blaſphemie. G. Powel. *Reply.*

So cryed the High Preiſt, when Chriſt confeſſed himſelfe to be *the Sonne of the livyng God.* Math. 27. 65. If it had pleaſed you notwithſtanding, you might in charitie haue otherwiſe vnderſtood the authors words. But let the meanyng be as you take it: haue you caught him in any trap? Nothing leſſe. For what elſe can be gathered, but that in the profeſſion of the goſpell here in England, there are defects and wants? That the Church of Chriſt among vs, is in ſome ſort defectiue? And although we haue Chriſt in his word and Sacraments, and in other exerciſes of religion, yet we haue not whole Chriſt, in that we haue not all his ordinances? And that therefore ſome thing more ought to be added, that Chriſt may raigne more fully & abſolutely over us? Neither is there any ſuch ataxie in the Diſcipline by theſe wordes ſignified. For we deſire nothing but *the order, wherin the Apoſtle reioyced.* Coloſ. 2. 5. Whereof alſo we haue the *rudera*, and (as it were) the *ſtumps* yet remaynyng, in our Pariſhionall Church-wardens and ſidemen: though intituled with other names, and wanting that ordination and authority, which with

the Paſtors within there owne Pariſhes, Elders ought to haue. This Diſcipline (if we might haue equall hearing) we could eaſily free from all ſuch imputations, as wherby it is commonly diſgraced by the adverſaryes therof with Princes and Nobles. Yea we could plainely and truely ſhew the ſame to be nothing prejuditiall, but very helpfull both to all Royall authority, and alſo to Nobility: yea better agreeyng with the one and the other, then all other inventions of men for Eccleſiaſticall goverment whatſoever. Touching the intollerable blaſphemie, imputed in the end of this note to the author of the Argumēts by way of an exclamation, it lyeth upon them, that feare not openly to deny Chriſt Ieſus to be *law giver and King of his Church*. How it can be caſt upon us, for deſiryng whole *Chriſt Ieſus* (I meane all his ordinances) I can not diſcerne.

Further anſwer to the Fith Argument.

G. Powel Zeale and courage for defence of Gods truth and Church is commendable: but it were raſhnes and foole hardines: for any to adventure hazard and danger, by intermedling in a frivolous quarrell, and in a cauſe not juſtifiable.

Reply. Now you pay home indeede. If *Cardinall Wolſey* were livyng, he could ſpeake no more imperiouſly. For except by *a frivolous quarrell, and a cauſe not iuſtifiable*, you meane not the cauſe of the Miniſters; you ſpeake nothing to the purpoſe. If you meane that (as needes you muſt) then doe you not ſpeake to vs poore Miniſters alone, but alſo to the Parliament, and to all other (Noble men or gentlemen) that haue intermedled, or ſhall intermedle in our cauſe. Yea, then you doe not cunnyngly, but openly & playnly, charge all ſuch with raſhnes and foolehardines. If you had been a man that in heart had not cared for the oppoſition of any, yet this ſpeech would ſcarſe haue beſeemed your

M. Powels cenſure of the Parliament houſe.

306

your perſon. One of us for halfe ſo much againſt the meaneſt Prelat, yea againſt the baſeſt Chancellor, ſhould haue payd full ſweetly. But your ſide ſeeme to haue privilege of ſpeake and writing what you pleaſe againſt any, yea againſt many: yea againſt the High Court of Parliament. Yea, againſt whole Churches and kingdoms For the reſt if we cannot make our cauſe good and juſtifie the ſame, ſo that all your ſide ſhall not be able ſubſtantially to anſwer, without ſcoffing, rayling, wrangling and ſophiſticating, then let our quarrell be accounted frivolous, and our cauſe not juſtifiable.

There are great ods betweene theſe examples propoſed, and the refractarie miniſters caſe. G. Powel

There ſhould be ſuch ods. For the author reaſoneth not *á ſimilibus* or *paribus*, from likes or equalls, but from the leſſe to the greater. *Reply.*

In the tyme of *Nehemiah*, the Iewes by long captivity, were in great affliction, the walls of Ieruſalem broken downe etc. But our Church hath long floriſhed, is glorious ſtill, and more and more increaſeth. G. Powel

I will not ſay your wordes are like to his wordes that boaſted ſaying, *I am rich and increaſed with goods, and haue needs of nothing:* but this I ſay, that all beyng granted that you ſay, doth not hinder but further the cauſe. The more the Church floriſheth, the more eaſie it is to grant that, which the Arguments pleade for. Miniſters alſo of the word, are as neceſſary for the preſerving and increaſing of the glorie of Churches, as for the procuring therof at the firſt. But alas I would God our Church did ſo floriſh as you pretend. Indeed it hath many rich mercyes, God be bleſſed for them; but he that ſeeth not what the Church wanteth, doth not rightly acknowledge that which it hath. Is this the glory of a Church for Prelates to floriſh *Reply.* Revel. 3. 17

366

and flant it out gallantly: and for their men to ruffle it out luſtily? Nay rather, this is the glory of the world, and better beſeeming the Courts of Princes, and houſes of Noble men, then the calling of *orthodox Biſhops*, who ſhould as well in their life as in their doctrine, preach humilitie, modeſtie, and contempt of the world. The more glorious that Prelats are outwardly, the leſſe glorious (for the moſt part) they are inwardly. Yea it is to be obſerved, that the more the outward glory of Churchmen (as they are called) hath increaſed, the more hath true & inward glory decayed. The more alſo, that the inward and true bewty of the Church hath decayed, the more hath the outward ſtate and pompe of the officers thereof increaſed. When were the Preiſts of the law, of greater outward authority, and tooke more upon thē, then when the church of the Iewes touching true beuty, was in worſt caſe? *Serch the ſcriptures for they beare witnes heerof.* Yea, were there ever ſo many degrees of dignitie in the Church, and doe we ever reade of ſo great ſtate and pompe of the Preiſtes in the former tymes, as there was of the Preiſts, Scribes & Phariſes at the firſt commyng of Chriſt? And were ever things in ſo bad caſe before, as thē they were? So alſo ſine that, the more that truth of doctrine, and puritie of Diſcipline decayed in the Church, after the golden and moſt glorious age of the Apoſtles, the more did the Church grow unto, and ſwell in outward riches, pomp and glory. Experience alſo teacheth, that the more glorious Prelats are in their outward ſtate, the leſſe benefite the reſt of the Church hath by them; becauſe they take the leſſ paynes; at the leaſt, ſuch paynes, as are moſt agreable to the true Epiſcopall and miniſteriall calling, deſcribed in holy ſcripture. Wherein then is the true glory of the Church? I in

ſuch

ſuch miniſters of the word and other officers; as Chriſt hath commended. 2 In the performance of ſuch dutyes by them, as he requyreth, that is in preaching the word faithfully, in adminiſtring the Sacraments ſincerely, in praying zealouſly and aptly according to the neceſſityes of the Church, and in executyng Diſcipline wiſely, and juſtly: 3 In the effects of the former two, viz: in true knowledge, faith, loue, zeale, humility, patience, temperance, righteouſnes, peace, etc. Touching theſe thinges, the more we want ſom of thoſe officers that Chriſt hath cõmended by his Apoſtles to the Church, and the more negligent thoſe that we haue are in their duties, the more lamentable it is to ſee the carved pillers of the temple broken downe, and the faithfull workmen in Gods houſe to be caſt out, by whoſe labors it had been before built & brought to ſome good bewty. Touching the laſt, what chriſtian heart is ſo ſtony, that it doth not mourne? What eye ſo drye, that it doth not ſhead teares, yea rather, guſh out with teares, to conſider and behold, the meſery of our ſuppoſed glorious Church, by the ſpirituall nakednes, blindnes & poverty therof? I meane the great ignorance, the ſuperficiall worſhip of God, the fearfull blaſphemies and ſwaringes in houſes, and ſtreates, ſo alſo the direfull curſings, the open contempt of the word & Sacraments, the wicked profanations of the Lords dayes, the diſhonor of ſuperiours, the pride, the cruelty, the fornications, adultryes, and other uncleanneſles, the dronkennes, the covetouſnes, the uſuryes, and other the like abominations, almoſt as grevous as either heertofore in the tyme, or now in the places of Popery, when, and where, there was no preaching at all of the goſpell? O *M. Powel*, and yee my Reverend Fathers, and brethren in the miniſtery (even of

367

368 10.

the conformable ſorte, flatter not your ſelues in this behalfe, but behold and pity the wofull and lamentable ſtat of our Church in theſe things.

But to returne, heerin you erre not a litle, in that you confound the ſtate of the Church, and of the common wealth of the Iewes. The Common wealth was indeed at that time, in much miſery. But was the Church alſo amongſt them, for ſuch thinges as wheerin cheifely conſiſteth miſery, in as bad condition? Had they not thoſe officers that God had preſcribed? Were the Preiſts and Levits either ſo ignorant, or ſo idle, or ſo ſcandolous, as many called Miniſters amongſt us? Were the faithfull and paynfull Preiſts and Levites, ſo urged to the obſervation of mens traditions and Ceremonyes in the worſhip of God, and otherwiſe ſo moleſted, as now many godly miniſters are? Were the people ſo blind, ſo irreligious, ſo unrighteous as now they are? Were the godly forced to heare dumme dogges, or corrupt teachers? Or reſtrayned from hearing of thoſe that preached wholſome doctrine, or urged to communicate with the Preiſtes in humaine Ceremonyes, to the greife of their ſoules, and woundiug of their conſciences, as many now are? The Lord giue you all ſuch conſideration of theſe thinges, that yee may not ſo much labour for outward pompe, preferments, honors, dignityes etc. As for the true felicitie of our Engliſh *Ieruſalem* and *Sion*, that God may build up the *walles* ther-of, and ſtill loue, and delight therin.

G. Powel

As *Nehemiah* having by prayer and faſting, found favour with an heathen King for the building of Ieruſalem, was reſiſted and hindred, by *Sanballat*, *Tobiah*, *Geſhem etc*. So worthy *Nehemiah* in the beginning of our religious Soveraignes reigne, finding grace for the continuance of the proſperous eſtate of our Church, begunne in the dayes of our bleſſed Queene, ſo many *Sanballats*, *Tobiahs* and *Geſhems*, as there

there be refractary miniſters and Papiſts, deryding and deſpiſyng us, labor to hinder our miniſtery etc.

369

The ods that before he ſpake of, now he maketh likes. Is this to diſpute *ad idem*, and to the purpoſe? *Reply.*

Touching his worthy *Nehemiah* (whom he compareth to auncient good *Nehemiah*,) let this be obſerved, that although he ſpeake of the prayer and faſting of the auncient *Nehemiah*, yet he ſpeaketh not of any prayer and faſting of his newe *Nehemiah*. What may be ſuſpected or noted heerin, I leaue to the conſideration of the wiſe and judicious reader, that remembreth what oppoſition many of the Prelats haue alwayes made to true faſting, and that alſo knoweth what be the thinges which men may fafely commẽd in prayer unto God, eſpecially, for which they may humble themſelues extraordinary in faſting before God. Touching the *Tobiahs*, *Sanballats*, and *Geſhems*, (whom fayne he would haue to be thoſe that he calles refractary miniſters, as well as the Papiſts,) let him not deceaue himſelfe heerin. For the wiſe & Chriſtian readers, are able to diſcerne, thẽ to be moſt worthy of theſe nães, that ſtriue moſt for mens precepts, that ſtudy more to pleaſe men then God, that preach not themſelues, and hinder them that would: whoſe cheefe worke, is not to encreaſe God his kingdome, but to uphold their owne, fearing nothing more then the downefall therof: which alſo feed not the Lords people, with the bread of eternall life, but their owne bodyes with the meate that periſheth and with all carnall delights: who care not to enrich the Lords people, with durable riches, that ſhall not be taken away, but plod day and night to enrich themſelues in this world, and to build great houſe for their poſteritie. Such are indeed the *Sanballats*, *Tobiahs*, and *Geſhems*, that doe

moſt oppugne the ſpirituall building of the ſpirituall Ieruſalem. Now although this anſwerer, & other not much vnlike thoſe before deſcribed, for a tyme reproch and ſcorne vs, by ſuch odious names and compariſons; yea, *plough upon our backes and make long furrowes*, yet the righteous Lord, in the end ſhall plead our cauſe againſt them, and bring forth our righteouſnes even as the mornyng Sunne; it may be in this world, that even thoſe that haue been through their raylings, and ſuggeſtions againſt us, hardly perſwaded of us, may at the laſt ſee and acknowledge our innocency: if not, yet in the world to come, when the longer the equity of our cauſe hath been obſcured and diſgraced, the more glorious it ſhalbe made, when ſome of our adverſaries (without repentance in the meane time) ſhall be throwne into the place, where is weeping and gnaſhing of teeth: and where to be indeed, is more then only to dreame thereof. Yea, the ſame *righteous Lord ſhall* (certaynely one day) *cut the cords of the wicked. They that hate Sion, ſhall be aſhamed, and turned backward.*

pſal. 129. 4,

G. Powel

Wee ſtill thinking moſt of theſe men to ſinne of ignorance, ceaſe not to pray unto God, O Lord open the eyes of theſe men, and lay not this ſinne to their charge.

Reply. contradiction.

See how this man tumbleth up and downe, and how he contradicteth himſelfe. Hath he not before expreſly charged *all of us, to doe that which we doe for carnall reſpectes?* Hath he not alſo in the ſame place (I meane in his preface) as expreſly ſayd, (ſpeaking not particularly of ſome of us, but indefinitly of all) *that it cannot be denyed, but that preſumptuouſly; and wilfully, we contend with the Magiſtrate, impugnyng his authority. etc.* How often elſe wher alſo doth he object unto us, wilfullnes, obſtinacy etc? Yea in the very next Argument, the note with (d) chargeth us with wil-

wilfulnes and ſuperſtitious obſtinacy: yet here, he ſayth that *moſt of us ſinne of ignorance.* If alſo he and other prayed in truth, that God would open our eyes, then let thē not plucke our tongues out of our heads: and ſo thirſt for our bloud, as many ſpeeches in this anſwer ſeeme to bewray then to doe.

G. Powel

In *Eſters* time, all the Iewes were in danger to haue been ſwalowed up by *Haman*, if *Queene Heſter* had not interceded. I hope the Supplicāts thinke not our Church to be ſo deſperat, neither outwardly nor ſpiritually.

Reply.

The whole Church of one place, and a whole kingdome, may fare the worſe for the ſinne of ſome one: yea, ſomtims long after the death of him, by whom that ſinne was committed. All Iſraell for the cruelty of *Saule* towards the *Gibeonits* (who yet were not Iſraelits) were puniſhed, even in their bodily ſtates, long after the death of *Saule*. May we then feare nothing to our whole Church and kingdom, for the hard dealing of the Prelats, towards the ſoules of many thowſands of our owne Nation? *Let no man deceaue us with vayne words. Bleſſed is the man that feareth alwayes.* There is danger in ſecurity, there is much ſafety in a godly feare. As for the ſpirituall danger of the Church, it appeareth by the decay of the ſpirituall bewty, and by the encreaſe of the ſpirituall deformitie, that is of ignorance & of impiety, in thoſe places already, which are depriued of their good Miniſters. How will theſe thinges increaſe in continuance of time? Yet it may be, that as the more the Ægyptians by oppreſſion laboured to ſuppreſſ the Iſraelits, the more they multiplyed: ſo the more that Prelats ſhall oppreſſe and ſilence us, the more God ſhall change the mindes of the conformitans themſelues, to diſlike thoſe thinges, which yet a litle they yeeld unto. If they ſhall hold their peace, yet God ſhall open

Ioſh. 7:11. 2 Sam. 21. Epheſ. 5.6 Pro. 28.14.

the mouthes of children to giue him prayſe, and to beare witnes unto his truth: If they alſo be ſilent, the Lord can make *euen the ſtones to crye.*

The examples of *Ioſeph* and *Nicodemus*, are altogether impertinent.

G. Powel. For neither had *Pilat* any reaſon, to deny the buriall of Chriſts body: neyther is the miniſters requeſt, concernyng croſſe and ſurplice, of ſuch importance as the buriall of Chriſts body: for it is not true that they contend about whole Chriſt.

Reply. The Argument ſpeaketh *of the honorable buriall of Chriſts body*, the anſwerer onely of the buriall, leaving out *honorable*; Is not this ſophiſtry? Though perhaps *Pilate* had no reaſon, to deny the buriall of Chriſt; yet Chriſt beyng

Sophiſtry: put to death (in part) for ſuppoſed treaſon, he had carnall reaſon, to deny honorable buriall: the more becauſe of the ſpite and mallice of the Scribes and Phariſes againſt Chriſt. For as before, when they ſayd, *he that maketh himſelfe a King, ſpeaketh againſt* Ceſar, he made the more haſt

Iohn 19. 12 to judgment againſt him, ſo he had cauſe in feare of their like hatred and mallice, to be the ſlower in granting his body to them to be buryed, who he knew in reſpect of their honorable perſons and places, would bury it in the moſt honorable manner they could. As *Pilat* had cauſe to feare the mallice of the Scribes and Phariſes heerin, ſo alſo and much more, had *Ioſeph* & *Nicodemus* cauſe to feare the ſame, by performyng the leaſt honorable fervice vnto Chriſt: eſpecially *Nicodemus*, being one of the ſame coate might feare it. If the Miniſters requeſt concerning Croſſ and Surplice, be not of ſuch importance, as the buryall of Chriſts body, this weakeneth not, but addeth ſtrenght to the Argument. For the leſſe it is, the more eaſily it may be granted, and the more eaſily it may be granted, the more boldly it may be ſued for.

THE SITX ARGVMENT.

If

If God reſpected the teares of reprobate Hagar, *in want of water of this life for* Iſhmaell: *and of the women, cruelly uſed by their husbands. If Chriſt alſo pitied many in their bodily miſeryes, yea ſome, that being heathen, were in that reſpect litle better then doggs; then much more this Honorable Court, ought to pity the mone and lamentation of many Congregations, deprived of their faithfull Paſtors, for want of the water and bread of eternall life, which ſometime the ſayd Paſtors, were wont to giue unto them.* 373

Gen. 21. 16
Malachi 2: 13: 14:
Mat: 15: 22.

But the firſt is true, Ergo. *The ſecond ought to be performed; & conſequently, the Honorable High Court of Parliament, ought to ſpeake for thoſe Miniſters and people, that doe ſo mourne.*

Marginall notes.

G. Powel

a The refractarie miniſters, ought to haue had compaſſion on their ſheepe, and not deſperatly to haue forſaken them for croſſe & ſurplice.

Reply.

We muſt ſo haue compaſſion one our ſheepe, that we wound not our owne ſoules. We muſt (as hath been ſayde) *eſchew evill, and doe good:* not commit evill, to doe good. As gold may be bought to deere, ſo may the good of our people. That which is heere ſaid againſt us touching croſſe and ſurplice, may alſo be ſayd touching images, if we were commaunded to worſhip them, Our yeelding alſo would be ſo offenſiue, that we ſhould not doe that good, that we intend by yeelding. We may alſo feare the hardenyng of our heartes by yeelding, as well as we ſee the hearts of other by litle ſinnes, to be hardned for greater.

The note with (b) is often anſerwred.

G. Powel

e Abſurd. The woman was ſuch, as that Chriſt himſelfe teſtified of her, that he had not found ſo great faith in Iſraell. Read the place.

Reply.

Abſurd. Our Saviour ſpeaketh not that of that womã, but of the *Centurion.* Though the Notary were an *Archbitſhop*, yet I might intreat him, better to read the place. Math: 8, 10

Mat:15.28. But Chriſt ſayd, *O woman, great is thy faith?* What then?
374 Though as ſhee was elect, ſhe was alſo bleſſed: yet as ſhe was out of the viſible Church, the words of our Saviour might be ſpoken of her. Neither doth the author ſay, that ſhe was a dogge: but that ſhe was litle better then a dogg, & in that reſpect, that is, as ſhe was a Cananit, & none of the children of Iſraell. Is ther no difference betwixt theſe words, & to ſay plainly, that ſhe was a dog? Yet the words of our Saviour are playne. *It is not meete to take the childrens bread, & to caſt it to dogs, or whelps.* Therfore this note repro
Sophiſtrie. veth our Saviour, and not the author of the Arguments.

The two next ſcoffing notes with (d) and (e) haue been often anſwered. We leaue not our flockes in the playne field, but are driven from them by force, becauſe we will not diſpleaſe God, to pleaſe the Prelats.

f Onely Chriſt is the husband of his ſpouſe. Heere the ſupplicants
G. Powel blaſphemouſly papize. For I thinke they meane not this literally. If they doe, they are ſurely very honeſt men in the meane time:

Reply. *A man ſhould firſt caſt out the beame that is in his owne eye,*
Math:7,5 *before he find fault with a mote in another mans eye.* As Chriſt is the onely Archbiſhop of the Church, ſo I acknowledg him alſo the onely husband of his ſpouſe. For the one title, is as proper unto Chriſt, as the other. But heere the Notary falleth agayne, over head and eares, into the ſame ſophiſtry, that in the former note with (c) he did. The au-
Sophiſtry thor ſayth, that ſuch Miniſters had performed the duety as it were of husbands; the notary cryeth out blaſphemy, as if he had ſimply called them, the husbands of the churches. The author therfore, did not blaſphemouſly papize. But let other take heed of like papizing, that uſurpe ſuch names and authority, as are proper onely to Chriſt; and neither are, nor can be maynteyned by any other Argu-

ments,

ments, then ſuch as wherby the Papall dignity of the Antichriſt of Rome is ſupported. The latter part of the note is to lothſome for any Chriſtian tongue to reade, or chaſt eares to heare: therfore I caſt it out on the dunghill, as vnworthy of any anſwer.

g A lying hyperbole: G. Powel

Then belike the Prophet *Malachi*, (upon alleaging of whoſe words this note is grounded) uſed *a lying hyperbole*. God that putteth up all the teares of his children into his bottle, knoweth and beholdeth this, and will one day, *wype away theſe, and all other teares from their eyes*: when they that in the meane time ſcorne ſuch teares of the godly (*ſo farr are they from mournyng with them that mourne*, and being ſory *for the afflictions of Ioſeph*) ſhall except they repent) haue more, then their bellyes full *of weeping and waylyng, and gnaſhing of teeth*.

Reply Mala: 2, 13: 14 Rom 12, 15 Iob. 30, 25 Amos 6, 6

h If the refractary Miniſters be ſo unkind, and hard hearted, that they will haue no pity upon them, then may they be otherwiſe releeved well inough: G. Powel.

Reply.

The Lord that ſearcheth the heartes of all men, knoweth the affections of ſome of the Miniſters now deprived, to be ſuch towards their people, that if they might ſtay with their people with comfortable conditions, they had rather ſtay, (though their maintenance be but ſmall) then accept of a thowſand pound by the yeare elſe where with as good conditiõs. Therfore hardnes of heart is not to be objected vnto them. Touching the reſt of this note, it is ſtrange, that in the queſtion of depriving ignorant Miniſters, according to the law & ſtatute in that behalfe, this hath ben the principall objection, where, or how, wil you haue their places ſupplyed? Much like to the queſtion of the Diſciples, *whence ſhould we get ſo much bread in the wildernes, as ſhould ſuffice ſo great a multitude?* Now the

376

queſtion being of our deprivation againſt law, and the paucity of ſufficient Miniſters being objected, reply is made, *There is ſtore, the Churches may be releeved otherwiſe.* But let them be firſt releeved, that haue ignorant Miniſters, not knowing the principles of religion themſelues, much leſſe able to teach other.

Further anſwer to the 6. Argument.

G. Powel If ſuch congregations doe ſo mourne, then the more hard hearts haue thoſe cruel tyrants rather then ſheepherds, that without pity, deſperatly forſake them, for litle or no cauſe:

Reply. The ſubſtance of theſe wordes being the ſame with the former note, is anſwered before: yet here I ad, 1 that it is more cruelty for the Prelats, for litle or no cauſe to depriue ſuch Paſtors. 2 that this anſwerer ſeemeth ſtill to account, ſinnyng againſt God to be litle or nothing. 3. that a theefe by the like reaſon, may complayne of the hardnes of his heart, that had rather loſe his Purſe, then haue his throate cut.

G. Powel Thoſe Congregations may ceaſe mournyng, and comfort themſelues, becauſe there is ſtore inough of able Miniſters, and they ſhall haue thoſe, that will not run away from them:

Reply. Take away tautologyes and other ſuperfluityes, and this anſwere it ſelfe would ſcarſe haue been an obular or two farthing pamphlet. The firſt part of this anſwer, hath been removed before. Thoſe that will not runne away, where are they to be found? What net may one haue to ketch them, what keepe to hold them? For doe not the Formaliſts dayly run away from their people? Doe they not take another lyving, and keep the former alſo, leaving one to ſome journyman, fit for all companyes? Yea, both Maſter & man, oftentymes leave both flocks to the *Wolfe*, yea, I knowe ſome that for ſake their owne charges, and are curats elſe where under other. And to whome doe

ſome

some of them leaue their owne? To one, that all the week long goeth to hedging, ditchyng, throshyng, and other day labor for his livyng: who on the Lordes day, is at Church, with a white Surplice to read service. In harvest also they take harvest worke, as ordinarily as other harvest men. I haue seene it, not long since with my eyes. Some also within a fortnight after they are possessed of a living, of good worth, let it out for divers yeares, and so take their leaue of the people, to serue a cure under another. O miserable condition of such a people. Whose heart melteth not to think of such wretched watchmen? What liklyhod therfore is there, that the Congregations deprived of their godly, loving & paynefull Pastors, shall haue other as faithfull, that will not run away from them? Touching the answer to the consequence of the former Argument, that the Pastors should *rather returne to their people and comfort them, obeying the wholsome ordinances of the Church etc:* I answer that we will so doe, when such ordinances are proved by Gods word to be wholsome.

977

THE 7 ARGVMENT.

All true Ministers, are as the Chariots and horsmen of those kingdomes where they are. In the Ministery of the gospell, and sincere worship of God therin commended, consisteth the glory of Kings and kingdomes. So also the peace: yea also their whole outward prosperity. And the contempt of the gospell and of the sincere worship of God, procureth all outwarde calamityes of Kings and Kingdomes. Ergo

2 king. 2, 12 & 13. 14 Prov. 3. 16 psal. 45. 12 1 Sam. 4, 21 Ephes. 6. 5 Isai. 2: 4 and 65: 25: 2 chron, 14: 14, 17, 10: 27. 6,

As men wilbe faithfull to Kings and Kingdomes, so they must maynteyne the sincere Ministery and Ministers of the gospell, and therfore speake for them.

The Marginall Notes.

a Is a handfull of refractary ministers, the safety of the whole land: G. Powel

378 Reply.

1 *Cosmographers* in some Maps describe a bird called a *Ruc*, of such bignes, that she taketh vp an *Elephant* with her talants very high into the ayre, and then letteth him fall to be broken and bruised, for her to feed on. It seemeth, this Notary hath an hand as large as the foote or tallants of this bird, sith he maketh but an handfull of all the Ministers suspended, deprived, or like so to be, for these matters now in question. Secondly, As the loss of one of his Majesties shipps Royall, or of one of his strongest holdes, or of one of his most worthy warriors, may be sayde to weaken the whole Kingdome, especially in the time of great warre: and as the cutting in sunder of one principall post, or beame or piller of an house, doth weaken the whole house; so, and much more is the losse & cutting of of so many worthy ministers of the gospell, the weakenyng of the whole land. For is not Satan, and are not Papists, and all the rest of Satans army, so much the more strenghtned? *Elia* was but one, and accounted (as we are) *a troubler of Israell*: and left *Elisha* behind him: and yet the Argument telleth you; how they were accoũted, though in their tyme there were many other Prophets. O therefore, that the meanest able and godly Minister, might not be lightly regarded, in these last and dangerous tymes. Howsoever they are esteemed of by the world, yet they are of more price, then great riches.

2 king. 2, 15 and 9. 1.

G. Powel b As if God never had defended any Pagan, in case of innocency and justice etc:

c Outward prosperity consisteth in pure worship: They speake so profoundly, as an intelligent and sensible man, cannot understand them: As if the ungodly florished not ofttymes, as a greene bay tree: and the outward prosperity of the *Persians* and *Romanes*, did not surpasse the meane estate of the Iewes, the true Church of God:

If there had been no name set to this booke, these two

Reply

notes,

379

notes, and many other the like, might haue brought it in ſuſpition to haue been penned by ſome profeſſed *Atheiſt*. For (who almoſt but ſmelling of religion,) would haue objected ſuch things? Yea, who that had but taſted of logike, would haue denyed the concluſion, not regarding the proofes and premiſes? The wicked doe indeed, ſome times in joye outward proſperity, either to molifie their owne hearts, or to harden them the more to be the fitter for Gods judgmentes, or to be ſcourges of God unto other: or to make them the more inexcuſable: yet they haue no aſſurance, either of gettyng, or of holdyng ſuch proſperity. Neyther can they haue any more comfort thereby: then the godly may haue diſcomforte by their afflictions: becauſe indeed they haue no intreſt thervnto from God. It is alſo a ſhamefull untruth, that the *Perſians*, *Romans*, or any other, in outward proſperity excelled the Iewes, ſo long as the Iewes regarded the word, honored the Prophets and other Miniſters thereof, and mayntayned the pure worſhip of God. All that while, they were even in outward things the glory of all the world. What people ever had the like victoryes? What Nation for all proſperity was comparable to *Iſraell* in the dayes of *Salomon*, and to the *Iewes* afterward, in the time of many other Kings? Of what Citie are ſo glorious things ever written as of *Ieruſalem*? Read the places in the margine. Indeed after that they contemned the word of the Lord, abuſed his prophets, and neglected God his worſhip (and that eſpecially through the fault of their Preiſts etc.) then the Lord forſaking them, made their enimyes the cheife etc.

pſal: 48: 2: 87: 2: & 12: Lamēt. 1: 1 and 2: 1:

Lament: 1: 5

The other notes upon this Argument, I paſſe by, as either anſwered before, or being of no moment.

Further anſwer to the 7 Argument.

G. Powel VVhat can a ſenſible man make of this enthymem? The refractary miniſters are the ſafety of the whole land, Ergo, the Court of Parliament muſt ſpeake for the goſpell.

Reply. The title refractary omitted, he is a ſenſles man, that can make nothing of that *enthymem*: eſpecially theſe miniſters pleaded for, being proved true and faithfull. For though the goſpell and Miniſters thereof be diſtinct, yet he that ſpeaketh for one, ſpeaketh for both, and he that ſpeaketh for both, ſpeaketh for the land, the ſafety whereof dependeth upon both. But marke heere agayne, the

Sophiſtry: anſwerers ſophiſtry; For wheras the author ſaith, that the Parliament is to ſpeake for the goſpell & Miniſtery thereof, the anſwerer taketh the word goſpell, and altogeather leaveth out, the other words, and the miniſtery thereof.

G. Powel There are thowſandes of faithfull Miniſters beſids them in this kingdome, that are Charets and horſemen etc. Miniſters are therfore termed Charets and horſemen, becauſe they are Gods inſtruments for gathering of the Saincts, Ergo: The antecedent is improbable, if not falſe: Againe, theſe men refuſe their Miniſtery, wherfore they cannot be called charets: yea ſo farre are they from being the ſafety, that would God they were not the ſores of the Church, and ſowers of ſedition, I meane ſchiſme and faction:

Reply. As there are ſome other faithfull Miniſters, ſo there are not many thouſands that are able, much leſſe faithfull beſides us. Generally throughout the land, there are Sixe reading miniſters, for one preacher, at the leaſt by practis. For there are ſome that are licenſed to preach, that never did, are, or were able to preach. Many alſo that can preach ſeledome doe Preach. Some alſo that doe preach, (and that often) doe it ſo Popiſhly or otherwiſe ſo corruptly: ſo fooliſhly and ridiculouſly, to make ſporte rather then to edifie: ſo vaynly and unprofitably, that it were better to hold their peace then ſo to preach.

That Miniſters are called charets and horſmen for gathering

381

thering the Saints, (viz: out of the power and holdes of the Devill) may be the truth in part: but yet, they being (in the places alleaged) called the charets and horſmen of Iſrael, not of the Saints, (and moſt of the Iſraelits being then wicked) and theſe titles being acknowledged of *Eliſha* by a wicked King, that reſpected not the gathering of the Saints, but the outward defence of his kingdome, by the prayers and preaching of *Eliſha*: it cannot be the whole truth. That we are ſuch ſores as the anſwerer ſpeaketh of, is not proved. Indeed ſome conformitans ſo account us, becauſe we rub their ſores ſo much, and deſire ſo earneſtly the healing of them, that ſo their ſoules may be the better ſaved. We are alſo eye-ſores to them: but ſure I am, that we are not ſo to the godly, many of whoſe ſores, God hath cured by us, and to whom our miniſtery hath been *the ſavor of life, unto life.* Other thinges in this argument, haue received their reply.

THE 8 ARGVMENT.

The proceedings of the Biſhops & other Eccleſiaſticall Iudges againſt the Miniſters in ſilencing and depriving of them, is againſt the law, Ergo.

This High Court of Parliament, being the chiefeſt Court of iuſtice in all this kingdome, ought to releeue them.

The marginall notes upon the 8 Argument.

The firſt 3 notes I paſſe by; as note-les.

d Object againſt theſe, and you ſhall be anſwered: G. Powel *Reply.*

How ſhall we be anſwered? With words, and raylings, as before, not otherwiſe. To the oth *Ex Officio*, and to the *Canons* afterward.

a Theſe men would bring in all by popular triall: G. Powel *Reply.*

Nay rather, would not the Prelats be glad to haue all perſons and all cauſes ſubject to themſelues? But more to

382 this afterward.

b A ſenſles ſentence: How can a man in matters of eternall life, be caſt out of his freehold:

G. Powel *Reply* A ſimple cavill, from the miſplacing of a comma. The Notary might well haue perceived, that theſe wordes, (*in matters of eternall life,*) were to be joyned with the words goyng before, *ambaſſadors of Ieſus Chriſt*, not with the words following, *ſhould be caſt out of their freehold.* This I ſay he might well haue perceived, becauſe there had been no ſpeech of our freehold of eternall life, but only of this life.

G. Powel. c The Eccleſiaſticall judge may proceed Ex officio: (d) directly againſt the ſtatute, 1 Elizab: cap: 2

Reply. Theſe two notes being in the margine contiguœ, and touching one another, I joyne together in my reply; the rather becauſe (d) the letter of the ſecond note, and the mention of the ſtatute in the end of the ſayd ſecond note omitted, they may both in better ſenſe and truth, be read thus togeather, *Eccleſiaſticall Iudges may proceed ex officio, directly againſt the ſtatute.* For touching the former note with (c) let the beſt *Civilian* ſhew (if he can) by what other law, the Eccleſiaſticall judge may proceed *ex officio*, then by the Canon law aboliſhed by ſtatute. The ſecond note with (d) ſhall be ſatisfied afterward.

The note with (*e*) of begging the queſtion, is now too ſtale.

G. Powel f As if God and his Sonne Chriſt Ieſus were not preſident of the religious aſſembly already: An unchriſtian ſuggeſtion:

Reply When the Prophet exhorteth the Church, *to open her dores for the King of glory to come in:* did he ſignifie that the Church had not before interteyned the *King of glory?* When Chriſt ſaith, *Open unto me my ſiſter &c.* doth he meãe that his ſiſter had him not at all before? Chriſt dayly knoc

pſal. 24, 7: 9
Cant: 5: 2:

keth

keth by his word and Sacraments, at the heartes of all the faithfull to be let in. Are they therfore altogether without Christ? Allthough therfore Christ be already president in the Parliament, yet by the propounding of any good cause, he desireth to be further interteyned amongst them. This the author hath acknowledged, by calling thē often a Christian assembly: by commending their Christian zeale against the Papists etc. But this is the answerers sophistry before noted, to reason from the wāt of a thing in part, to the want thereof altogether. Therefore this is an vnchristian and simple collection. Revel. 3. 20 Sophistry.

Further answer to the 8 Argument.

I am constrayned to dance as the suppliants Pipe: They lead, and I followe. G. Powel

Reply.

Nay we haue piped unto you, and yee haue not danced. We haue mourned unto you, and yee haue not lamented. Neither to evident Argumentes out of holy scripture, will you submit your human ordinances, or your selues: neither by any gentle and humble petitions, will yee Prelats come to any brotherly peace. Mildnes doth as much provoke you as bitternes. *M. Nichols* of *Kent*, writyng most mildly and humbly, was rewarded severely, with suspension, deprivation, degradation. Our most humble petition to the *Convocation*, at the first Sesion of this Parliament, received a most rough answer. *We seeke peace, and when we speake thereof, ye are bent to warre.* As though yee sate in heavenly places, *we haue been unto you more vile then the earth.* I complaīe not thus of all the Prelats. I know that some are wiser, milder, kinder, and more curteous thē other. As the bramble tooke more upon it, *then the Olive tree, the vine or the fig tree*, so sometyme it is among Prelats. Mat. 11. 17 psal. 120. 7. Iob. 31. 8. Iudg. 8. 15

Hitherto they prayed your Honors but to speake for them etc. Now they urge you to determyne, and actually to decree something G. Powel

in their behalfe:

We neither prayed nor urged any thing to be doone,
G. Powel but with all humility and loyalty: hoping that his moſt excellent Majeſty vpon the ſight of the reaſons, why they had decreed or determined any thing (ſo farre as they might among themſelues) would likewiſe in his Princely and chriſtian regard, haue vouchafed his Royall aſſent to their ſuch decrees and determinations: which although it haue not pleaſed his Highnes yet to doe, yet we hope that heerafter upon further cõſideration, ſome other may find further grace with his Majeſtie in the like behalfe.

G. Powel To the conſequence of the former Argument:

The conſequence hath 2 parts, whereof the firſt is granted, but that the deprived and ſuſpended miniſters ought to be reſtored is denyed, becauſe they haue not juſtified their cauſe, and declared that they are vnjuſtly oppreſſed, nor can ever doe:

Reply. Touching the former anſwer, may it pleaſe the reader, firſt to remember, that all the authors ſpeech of the proceedings of the Biſhops againſt Miniſters ſuſpended etc: is only to be underſtood of ſuch Miniſters, as whom they ſuſpend, and depriue, onely for ſuch cauſes as are mentioned in the title of the Argumentes, not of other whom they ſuſpend or depriue for any juſt cauſe. Now to proceede, that ſuch Miniſters haue not yet in law (whereof the preſent queſtion is) juſtified there cauſe, and declared that they are unjuſtly oppreſſed, nor can ever doe, is not for want of matter of juſtification, or for want of the truthof unjuſt oppreſſion (I meane only by the Prelats) but becauſe they haue not been admitted, to proſecute the iuſtice of the land, nor to call in queſtion the proceedings of their ordinaryes: who haue been hitherto both Agents and Iudges; both accuſers and advocats in their owne caſes againſt them. And eſpecially becauſe upon

pre-

pretenſe of a *Canon* lately made, (repugnant to the lawes, ſtatutes; and cuſtomes of the Realme) they be not ſuffered by the *Archbiſhops Iudge ad quem*, to plead and to proſecute their appeales, and to declare their innocency according to the auncient laudable, and common uſage and iuſtice of the land: unto which grevance alſo many more exorbitant injuſtices (by the Prelats) heereafter mentioned may be added. Let the anſwerer therfore vnderſtand, that ſom Ordinaryes in their publike ſentēces, haue moſt uniuſtly charged ſome Miniſters, with denyall of the oth to the Kings ſupremacy: which notwithſtanding, divers tymes before, they had willingly ſworne vnto, and which at the very inſtance of pronouncyng the ſentence, they offred before their Ordinary to ſweare unto agayne. And not onely thus leſingly, (to make the Perſons of the ſayd Miniſters more odious to our moſt Chriſtian King, his State, and all his people) in their publike ſentences of deprivation, have ſom Ordinaryes traduced the good name and eſtimation of the Miniſters, but alſo without any other ſpeciall crime worthy deprivation mētioned in their ſentences, haue they ſtuffed their ſentences full, only with generall wordes of generall crimes, contrary to the right forme of judgment. For by right forme of judgment, the Ordinaryes ought not to haue impeached the Miniſters, becauſe of generall crymes, but they ought to haue ſayd, and put in certeyne, in what thinges, and in what manner the ſayd miniſters haue done any thing worthy puniſhment of deprivation.

The Biſhop of Lincolne againſt the the Miniſters of Leiceſterſhire.

An other grevance & unjuſt oppreſion (by the ſayd Prelats) of the ſayd ſilenced miniſters, is, that upon ſentence of deprivation and appeales of the Miniſters, the Ordinaryes haue given notice to the Patron of the voy-

386

dance of the Church, and upon new preſentation of the Patron, haue not onely inſtituted new clarkes; but alſo (to avoyd the poſſeſsion of the Miniſter deprived and appealing) haue ſuggeſted and intimated by their certificatory writ, under their publike ſeale unto the King, into his Court of Chancery, that the poſſeſsion of the church was kept *per vim laicam*, & withall haue prayed the Kings writ *de ~~la~~ vi laica removenda*. By vertue of which writ (upon their ſuggeſtion & intimation) granted, (for without their ſuggeſtion and intimation it would not be granted) the party appellant, before the appeale finiſhed, hath ben removed out of his poſſeſsion by the Shiriffe of the Coũty. Notwithſtanding in truth, the Church, parſonage or vicarage houſe, had within the ſame, no manner of *vi laica* at all: but was onely quietly and peaceably poſſeſſed, by the late derived ſpirituall perſon, and his poore family.

Old natura brevium fol 33. Que breife ne ſer grant, avant que leveſque de tiel lieu eit certifie en le Chácerie per ſõ breif de tiel reſiſtance.

And that this manner of a poſſeſsion of a Church, by a ſpirituall perſon and his family, by the law of the Kingdome, is not to be holden *vis laica*, is playnly iuſtified, by a late judgment given by the Kings Iuſtices, touching the poſſeſsion of the Church of *Newton Valencæ* in the Dioceſſe of *Winton*. For where as a ſpirituall perſon poſſeſſed of the ſame Church, by vertue of the Kings writ *de vi laica removenda*, was removed out of his poſſeſsion, and another ſpirituall perſon put in poſſeſsiõ of the ſame church; the ſpirituall perſon diſpoſſeſſed, upon the matter heard and examined, before the Kings Iuſtices, that he was a mere ſpirituall perſon, and that his Church was poſſeſſed onely by himſelfe, and his domeſtikes, was by an other of the Kings writs reſtored into, and poſſeſſed of the ſame Church; and which Church unto this day, he peaceably holdeth and injoyeth.

A 4 grevance of the ſilenced Miniſters, is that (ther beyng a *Canon* made in the laſt *Synod*, that *no iudge ad quem* ſhall grant any Inhibition to the judge *a quo*, unleſſe he firſt ſee the originall appeale) ſundry Ordinaryes upon appeales made before them, haue taken order with their Regiſters and Notaryes, not to deliver to the partyes appellant, any noate or copy of any act or ſentence, made or given before them. Where upon not onely the party appellant is wronged, but the Notary alſo upon refuſall of grãting to the party appellant (demaunding and tendring to the Notary his fee) a publike inſtrument of the publike Acts and Records of the Court, cannot but incurre the infamy of corruption and perjury: in as much as he beyng a publike Notary, is ſworne faithfully to execute the office of a publik Notary; the execution of part of which office, conſiſteth (he being requyred thereunto) in his teſtimony and delivery of the publike acts made in his preſence. Biſhop of Chicheſter & Salisbury

A fith injuſtice or rather nullity is, becauſe ſundry ſentences of deprivation haue been given *a Iudicibus non ſuis*, namely by ſuch Ordinaryes, whoſe power and juriſdiction Eccleſiaſticall at the time of giving their ſentẽces, was ſuſpended, ſhut up and cloſed, by the *Archbiſhop* of *Canterburyes* Commiſſion, and his Archiepiſcopall viſitation.

A 6 grevance or rather a nullity is, becauſe the whole power and juriſdiction Eccleſiaſticall, touching cauſes criminall, without exception or reſervation of the examination and definition of the crimes of Miniſters, by ſundry Dioceſans under their ſeale at armes, before that tyme was committed *in ſolidum* for terme of life & yeares not expired unto their principall Commiſſaryes, Officialls, or vicars generall: wherupon it conſequently followeth, the

388

ſame Dioceſans having nopower by the Kinges Eccleſiaſticall lawes, to reſume at their pleaſure their ſayd Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction, that the ſentences given by the ſayde *Dioceſans*, in theſe caſes are ſentences voyd and of none effect in the law, as being given *a Iudicibus iurisdictione in ea parte carentibus.*

A 7 grevance or rather nullity is, that ſentences haue been given *nullo Iuris ordine ſervato:* but *omni iuris ordine ſpreto et neglecto.*

An 8 injuſtice is, becauſe ſome acts and ſentences haue been made and given in ſome private chamber of ſome common Inne or Taverne, and not *in publico et competente foro*, in any publike or competent ſeate, of Eccleſiaſticall juſtice. As *M. Vinall* and *M. Warren*, in the Dioceſſe of *Chicheſter* were deprived, in a common Taverne, viz. at the ſigne of the *Ounce* and *Ivy buſh* in *Greenſteed.*

The 9 injuſtice is, becauſe ſome ſentences, given by ſome Eccleſiaſticall judges, for not uſe of rites and Ceremonyes, or not obſerving of the booke of Common prayer, haue not been given according to the tenor of and effect of the ſtatute of the firſt of our late *Queene*, vpon inquiſition, information, or accuſation, but only upon proces *ex mero officio*. A thing if not directly, yet by conſequence repugnant to the ſayd ſtatute; and therefore unwarrantable by the ſayd ſtatute. And therefore it is to be noted, that this marginall note (the Eccleſiaſticall judge may proceed *ex officio*) in pag 37. and this *parẽtheſis* (which they may doe *ex officio*) inſerted in the body of the ſtatute pag 42. is but a begging of the queſtion.

Certain Miniſters in the Dioces of Oxford & Lichfeld etc.

An other injuſtice againſt ſome Miniſters hath been cõmitted by ſome ordinaries, for that they haue deprived them for none other cauſe, then only for not ſubſcribing

to

389

to the 3 articles, mentioned in the 36. *Canon*. And this wrong hath been openly in Parliament acknowledged, to be a wrong by the Archbiſhop himſelfe, and by the Iudges and advocats of his owne Courts.

Theſe and many ſuch like thinges being thus, may it not be truely ſayd, that the Miniſters pleaded for are unjuſtly oppreſſed? And being ſo oppreſſed and without releefe any other way, haue they not juſt cauſe to ſupplicat to the High Court of Parliament? And hath not the ſayd High Court great reaſon, yea is it not bound to finde remedy, and to releeue them?

The anſwer concernyng the perſon of him who is ſayd abundantly to haue proved the unlawfulnes of the proceedings againſt the deprived miniſters, that he is *no iudge nor any good Civilian or common lawyer*, what reaſon haue you to be ſo reſolut heerin? He may be a judge, a good Civilian, or cõmon lawyer for ought you knowe, though you ſeeme never ſo doubtles therof. But what is this anſwer to the poynt in queſtion? Seeing it mattereth not, what the perſon of the probator be, if his proofes be ſufficient? And yet how meane ſo ever you thinke him, or his learning to be (if he be the party whom I ayme at) I ſhall doe no wrong (as I ſuppoſe to the cheefeſt judge, and beſt approved Civilian, of the now Archbiſhop of *Canterburyes* courts, if (without flattering the party) I ſhall affirme that he was a ſtudent and an advocate, and a Iudge, yea, I may (as I thinke) ſay more, a reader of and a director in the practiſe of the civill law about 30 yeares paſſed, to ſõe that be now Doctors of the ſame law.

But to let the perſon and learnyng of the probator paſſe, I reſolutely and directly anſwer to the anſwerers 3. *Queres* (the ſame being partly fraught with *equivocations*,

and partly childiſh and abſurd,) that the one ſorte can receaue no reſolute anſwer, before he haue reſolved his intrinſecall and mentall ſenſe and underſtanding, and that the other without queſtion, is a queſtion queſtionles. His firſt *Quere* then being this, namely, *whether the Church under Chriſtian godly Magiſtrats, hath any tribunall proper unto it ſelfe, for the decyding of controverſies, and puniſhing of ſuch perſons as ſhall refuſe the ordinances therof?* Unto this *Quere*, when he ſhall diſtinguiſh and make his ſo many *equivocations* (conteyned in the *Quere*) preſpicuous and playne, to the underſtanding of every ſimple & playne meanyng man, I ſhall (God willing) make him a ſimple, playne, reſolute, & direct anſwer. In the meane time let him underſtand, firſt that we may juſtly doubt, what he meaneth by the word Church: and namely, whether he meane the vniverſall Church, or a Nationall, a Provinciall, a Dioceſã, an Archidiaconall, a Decanall, a Capitular, or laſtly a Parochiall Church. For all men (as uſually and commonly we ſpeake) doe vnderſtand, that every of theſe Churches, hath her proper name, after which ſhe is ſo called: as namly the Church diſperſed throughout the world, is called the univerſall Church, the Church within England is commonly called the Nationall Church of England; the Church within the Province of Canterbury, the Provinciall Church of Canterbury, the Church of the Dioceſſe of London, the Dioceſan Church of London, etc. And laſtly the Church of great *S. Ellens* in London, the Parochiall Church of *S. Ellens* in London. And therefore I craue a reſolute and direct anſwer, of what onely perſons you meane that the univerſall, this Nationall, Provinciall, Dioceſan, Archidiaconall, Decanall, Capitular, and Parochiall Church conſiſteth? Who onely be the Chriſtian godly Magiſtrats, under whom every one of theſe

1 *Quere.*

Equivocations.

391

Churches liveth? Whether the ſame chriſtian godly Magiſtrates may perſonally be preſent, giue their expreſſe conſents, and haue their deciſive voyces, to & in making all and every decrees of every of theſe Churches? What is the tribunall proper to it ſelfe, of every of theſe Churches? What onely manner of controverſies, by every of theſe Churches may be decided? What onely kind of ordinances, every of theſe Churches may decree? What only kind of ſubject, and with what onely kind of puniſhment, and none other, every of theſe Churches may puniſh the refuſers of every their ordinances?

Our ſecond mayne ſcruple, touching this firſt *Quere*, ariſeth from theſe words (*vnder Chriſtian godly Magiſtrats*) For if by theſe words (*under Chriſtian godly Magiſtrats*) he underſtand that every of theſe Churches, livyng under the obeyſance of ſuch Magiſtrats, hath a tribunall proper unto it ſelfe, immediatly derived to the ſame by the holy law of God, wholly ſecluded from the Chriſtian godly Magiſtrats preſence (as was the Sanctuary divided from the Court) and wherinto the chriſtian godly Magiſtrats may no more at this day enter, or no more giue their conſents and deciſiue voyces, in making the ordinances therof, then it was lawfull in times paſt for the Kings of *Iuda* to enter into the holy place, and to burne incenſe at the Altar: then muſt we frame him one kinde of reply: but if he ſhall informe us, his mentall vnderſtanding to be thus, namely that the Chriſtian godly Magiſtrats, haue none other power, by law divine or human, but only to aſſemble every of the ſayd Churches, to ratifie the ordinances of every of the ſayd Churches, or hath onely power to commaund the ſame ordinances to be put in execution under them, then unto this anſwer we muſt ſhape him

392 an other manner of reply. Notwithstanding, in the meãe tyme this he must understand generally, that in right (though not alwayes in possesion & practise) the church beyng distinguished from the common wealth, hath the same power under a Christian, and under an Infidell Magistrat.

G. Powel 2 *Quere*. Whether so many judiciall acts of deprivation of Bishops from their benefices since the conqueſt, to the time of *Magna Charta*, and since that to this age, were ever held to be contrary to the lawes of this Kingdome?

2 *Quere*.

To dance after your Pipe, (I will not say, what a foolish and ridiculous question, but) what an od tune is this? For can a man dance after a pipe, before the Pipe be striken up? So could acts done before *Magna Charta*, and other lawes since made, be sayd to be contrary to them? This is as much, as one should aske, whether *Adam* not Circumcising *Cain* and *Abell*, did contrary to the law given for Circumcision, to *Abraham* many yeares after? Or whither *Ishmael* persecuted *Isaack*, before *Isack* was borne? Or whether stealing of horses an hundred yeares past, were punishable with death, before any law made for death in that behalfe? One thing cannot be sayd contrary to an other, that is not, neyther ever was extant *in rerum natura*. The Second part of this *Quere*, whether since the granting of *Magna Charta* unto this age, the judiciall acts of deprivation of Bishops etc: were ever held to be contrary to the law of this kingdome, and *Magna Charta*, we

Reply.

G. Powel shall answer (if God permit) more plentifully anone.

3 *Quere*. 3 *Quere*. Whether any Iudge of this Realme, or any cheife officer lerned in the lawes, be of opinion, that such sentences of deprivation, as haue lately passed in due forme, in any Ecclesiasticall Court, be contrary to any, much lesse to many statuts.

Reply. Though it were a sufficient answer to bid him goe looke

393

looke, and himſelfe to aske the opinion of every judge & learned officer, yet will I not altogether yeld him ſo ſhort and cutted an anſwer. And though it be a principle in Philoſophy, that *forma dat eſſe rei*, yet to the beyng of every thing there muſt be matter, to which the forme giveth being. And therefore in this caſe, beſides due forme, there muſt be alſo due matter, inſerted in due ſentences. Wherupon I craue a reſolute and direct anſwer, whether by thoſe words (*paſſed in due forme*) he meane paſſed for *matter and forme*, in due forme? Or whether he meane, paſſed without *due matter* in due forme onely? For if he meane by paſſed, (*for matter and forme,*) *in due forme*, then is his queſtion (without queſtion) either a fooliſh queſtion, or no queſtion at all. For who would queſtion, whether any Iudge or learned officer, could doubt, that a ſentence paſſed for matter, and forme in due forme, were a ſentence contrary to any, much leſſe to many ſtatuts? As though there were any Statuts ſo ridiculous and abſurd? On the other ſide, if he meane by *paſſed in due forme*, only due forme without due matter, then we anſwer that the ſame ſentence may be unjuſt, for want of due matter, and yet be juſt by reaſon of due forme. And ſo on the other parte, we affirme, that a ſentenee may be iuſt, by reaſon of due matter, and yet unjuſt by reaſon of an undue forme. How many ſentences therefore of deprivation ſoever, as haue been lately given without due and juſt matter, or without due and iuſt forme, we anſwer ſo many not to haue paſſed in due matter and forme, and ſo contrary to ſome lawes or ſtatuts. But were this queſtion wholly grãted, what eaſe and advantage can the opinion of any iudg or learned officer yeeld to thoſe Iudiciall acts of deprivation (wherupon the controverſie is grounded) which are

394 not passed in any due forme of any law, or Statute Ecclesiasticall whatsoever?

Furthermore touching this question, if the Prelats did intend that all their sentēces should be according to law, wherfore did they make a *Canon* against the ordinary prosecution of appeales? Yea, what needed such a *Canon*? What benefite is there to any appellant by his appeale, from a just sentence? Or what danger to the Iudge *a quo* by such appeales? The whole danger is to the appellant himselfe. For the sentence beyng just, he shall be sure to get nothing, neither the Iudge *a quo* to lose any thing by the appeale.

G.Powel. WHo having but halfe an eye, doth not see, but that (by pleading *Magna Charta* cap. 29:) they would not onely weaken, but also subvert and utterly overthrow all jurisdiction Ecclesiasticall?

Reply. Doth every one that desireth limitation of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, and laboreth to restrayne it from all communion of forreyne lawes, seeke the subversion therof? If also the lawes Ecclesiasticall, be the Kings Ecclesiasticall lawes, and the jurisdiction Ecclesiasticall, the Kings Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, then is this place of *Magna Charta*, so farre from subverting the jurisdiction or law Ecclesiasticall, as that by that place, the same law and jurisdiction is upheld, and more throughly established. That the law & jurisdiction Ecclesiastical ever hath been, and yet is accounted the Kings Ecclesiasticall law and juridiction shall be shewed anone.

G. Powel The sentences and graue determinations whereof (that is of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction) haue never yet in any age or Country, been submitted to popular triall, by the judgment of *Peeres* etc:

Reply All sent ces of Ecclesiasticall Courts, are not so graue but that some are somtymes repealed by Higher courts, and sometymes revoked by themselues. Sometyme also they

395

they meddle with matters not belonging unto them, and therfore by ordinary courſe of Commmon law, they are prohibited to proceed. Finally in ſome caſe the Biſhop giveth not Inſtitution to a benefice, untill by a Iury of 12. men (whereof 6. are to be of the Clergy, and 6 of the Layity) the controverſie *de iure patronatus* be decided. Yea ſometyme the Biſhop having inſtituted a clarke, is forced by writ from the common law, to admit of another clark preſented by another Patrone, and ſo to diſplace him whom before he had inſtituted. G. Powel

The place of *Magna Charta*, cannot be underſtood of Eccleſiaſticall jurisdiction, or the practiſe thereof, eſpecially if we conſider the end why this law was made, and the tyme when:

The Prelats ſhould make ſure worke indeed, if they could make, that no lawes were againſt their power. Thē might they take upon them without controlment, what they would under coloure of *Eccleſiaſticall iurisdiction*: as indeed they doe now pretily beginne to doe. *Reply.* G. Powel

The end was, that the Kings of this Realme, might not challenge an infinit and abſolute power, (as ſome Kings elſe where did, and yet doe) without judgment and lawfull proceedings, to take away any mans liberty, life, Country, goods, or lands.

Then belike the Kings Majeſtie is reſtrayned by *Magna Charta*, but the Prelacy is not. Is not this good ſtuffe? The King ſhall weare the Crowne, but the Prelats will beare the ſword. Whether now doe they that are falſely called *Puritans*, or the *Prelats* moſt encroch upon the Royall authoritye? *Reply.*

It was made at ſuch time, as the Kings thought Eccleſiaſticall jurisdiction, no more in right then in fact, to belong to the Crowne. Therfore the words haue no relation to Eccleſiaſticall jurisdiction. G. Powel

This is utterly falſe: yea the falſhood therof is evident by the teſtimony of that worthy and renowned Lawyer S. *Edward Cooke*, in the booke alleadged by the anſwerer. *Reply*

396

For he sayth expresely, that *as in temporall causes, the King by the mouth of Iudges in his Courts of Iustice, doth iudge the same by the temporall lawes of England; so in causes Ecclesiasticall etc. (the commusance wherof doth not belong to the common lawes of England) the same are to be iudged and determyned, by Ecclesiasticall Iudges, according to the Kings Ecclesiasticall lawes, etc.*

lib. de jure regis Eccle. fol:8

And againe, *observe good reader*, (sayth S.Edward Cooke) *seeyng that the determination of heresies etc. belongeth not to the Common law*, how necessary *it was for administration of Iustice, that his Maiesties progenitors* Kings of this Realme, *did by publike authority authorize Ecclesiasticall Courts under thē, to determyne those great and important causes, etc. by the Kings Ecclesiasticall lawes*. The jurisdiction therfore, Courts, and lawes Ecclesiasticall, in the opinion of the Kings progenitors were thought & held to be their own Kingly lawes, Courts, and jurisdiction. The same is further proved by the sayd *S. Edward Cooke*: by the president of *Renulphus*, in discharging and exempting the *Monastery* and *Abbot* of *Abinden*, from the jurisdiction of the Bishops and granting also to the saide *Abbot* Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction etc: by the president of *William* the first, who made inpropriatiō of Churches with cure, to Ecclesiasticall persons etc. and by divers presidents of other Kings since the conqueſt.

fol. 39

fol. 9

fol 10. 11:

That which in this parte of the answer, is afterward added of the necessary restitution of the right of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, to the Crowne is also confuted by the same *S. Edward Cooke*, who plainely saith, *that though there had been no such law of restitution made, yet it was resolved by all the Iudges, that the* Kings *and* Queenes *of* Englād *for the tyme being, by the auncient prerogatiue law of* England, *may make such a Commision etc.* And therfore by the auncient

397

ent *lawes of this Realme, this kingdome of* England *is an absolute Empire, and Monarchy, consisting of one head, which is the King, and of a body politike, &c. Also that the Kingly head of this body politike is furnished with plenary power. &c. to render iustice and right, to every part and member of this body.* Thus farre *S. Edward Cooke.* From all which it followeth, that the restitution of the auncient right, howsoever lawfully made (as being made by the whole body of the kingdome) was notwithstãding not necessarily made, as though without it, the King or Queene, for the tyme being, could not haue used their auncient right.

That which followeth in the 2. 3. and 4. branches of this 4 answer to the consequence of this 8 Argument, doth not belong to the matter, because it doth nothing justifie the proceedings of the Bishops or other Ecclesiasticall Iudges, in depriving of the Ministers pleaded for, in such manner and for such causes, as for which they haue depriveded them. The question is not whether jurisdiction Ecclesiasticall by the lawes of the land doth belong (under the King) unto the ordinaryes: nor whether the Ordinaryes in the exercise of the Kings jurisdiction Eccleiiasticall, and Consistoriall trialls, ought to proceed by vertue of *Peeres*, etc: but whether some Ordinaryes, exercising the *Kings Ecclesiasticall* jurisdiction, haue proceeded in their *Ecclesiasticall Consistories*, against some Ministers, without authority of the *Kings Ecclesiasticall law:* & therfore in that respect, contrary to *Magna Charta*, which requyreth nothing to be doone without the Kings law.

Further, although we grant (as *S. Edw. Cooke* instructeth us) all lawes Ecclesiasticall derived from other (which by and with a generall consent are approved and allowed here) to be aptly and rightly called the Kings Ecclesiasti- De jure Regis Eccles. fol. 9

call lawes of England: yet I deny that all lawes Eccleſiaſti call, derived by the Kings progenitors, either before or ſince the Conqueſt from others, are now in this age our Soveraigne Lord *King Iames* his Eccleſiaſticall lawes: and therefore howſoever many judiciall Acts of deprivation, of Biſhops & Preiſts, from their benefices &c. according to the Eccleſiaſticall law, which is called *ius Pontificium*, & which was derived, by the Kings Progenitors, from the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, either before, or ſince the Conqueſt, unto *Magna Charta*, and ſince that, to the 25 of King *Henry* the eyght, were never, all held, to be contrary, but were ever all held, to be agreable to the lawes of this kingdome: yet notwithſtanding, I affirme that all Iudiciall Acts and ſentences, (how many ſoever, of deprivation of Miniſters, from their benefices) had made and given, by the Eccleſiaſticall Iudges, ſince the 25. of *King Henry* the 8. onely according, or onely by force, and vertue of the ſayd *ius Pontificium*, or *Biſhop* of *Rome* his law, (the ſentences given in the time of *Queene Mary* excepted) are, and ought to be holden, not to be had, made & given, by the lawes of this kingdome, or by the Kings Eccleſiaſticall law: And why? Even becauſe the whole *ius Pontificium*, or *Biſhop* of *Romes* law was altogether (excepting the tyme of *Queene Mary*) abrogated, *adnulled*, and made voyd, by an Act of Parlament; and conſequently is but a meere *Alien, Forraine and ſtraunge law*, and no municipall law of *England*, and therefore not the Kings Eccleſiaſticall law.

25. Hen. 8 cap. 17

Wherefore our Soveraigne Lord *King Iames*, by this graunt of *Magna Charta* made by his progenitors, beyng obliged, to ſuffer no Free man of the Realme, to be taken or impriſoncd, or diſſeiſſed of his Frrehold, or liberties, &c. Nor to paſſe upon him nor condemne him, but by law-

lawfull judgment of his *Peeres*, or by the law of the land. We agayne assume from this statute of the great *Charter*, that sundry sentences of deprivation of Ministers, from their benefices, for causes before specified, are unlawfull; becawse such Ministers haue been condemned, and judgment hath been passed upon them, without lawfull judgment of their *Peeres*, or law Ecclesiasticall of the land. For heere we must giue the answerer to witt, by these words, (or law of the land,) that all the Kings lawes, of what nature or quality soever, whether Ecclesiasticall or temporall, and not only the lawes temporall, (as he insinuateth) are included. As therefore no temporall Free man of the Realme, may be condemned, passed upon, or disseised of his liberty, and frechold, &c. in a temporall cause, and in a temporall Court, without lawfull judgment of his *Peeres*, or temporall law of the land. Even so likewise, no Ecclesiasticall person, (beyng a freeman of the Realme) may be condemned, passed upon, or disseised of his liberty, or frehold, but by lawfull Ecclesiasticall judgement, according to the law *Ecclesiasticall* of the land. And heereupon we graunt, if the King haue any law Ecclesiasticall of the lād, for the deprivation of a Minister, from his liberty and frehold, for not subscription, perjurie, contempt of *Canonical* (so called *obedience*, omission of Rites, and Ceremonyes, not precise observation of the booke of Common prayer &c. Then we graunt, that the Ordinaryes (being the Kings Iudges Ecclesiasticall) may rightly depriue a Minister from his benefice, for these offences.

And yet still we deny, and shall be able to mainteyne, that sundry sentences of deprivation, made and given, by sundry Ordinaries, against svndry Ministers, be either unjust or unlawfull; or no sentences at all, for the reasons and

causes before ſpecified.

It is therefore erroniouſly alleadged, that that which was done by jurisdiction *Eccleſiaſticall*, when *Magna Charta* was granted, was not at that tyme taken to be done by the King, or by his authority, and that the lawes which *Eccleſiaſticall* Iudges practiſed, were not then held, to be the lawes of the land, or the *Kings* lawes. For the *Kings* progenitors, did both thinke and held, that jurisdiction *Eccleſiaſticall* did in right belong unto their Crowe, and therefore in fact, by right of their crownes, did they both exerciſe, and commaund to be exerciſed, in their Kingly names, their Kingly right, authority and jurisdiction *Eccleſiaſticall* within their Realmes. For how could thoſe Kings, haue commaunded, and how could their ſubjectes haue obeyed, if the Kings themſelues, had thought, and held, that the Eceleſiaſticall courts, lawes or jurisdiction, were not in right, no more then in fact, at that tyme belonging unto the Crowne as the anſwerer, vaynly, and childiſhly fancyeth? Which fancy alſo ſeemeth ſufficiētly confuted by the very title of *S. Edward Cooks* booke, *de iure regis Eccleſiaſtico*. For how could the Kings before and after the Conqueſt unto *Magna Charta* have been juſtly intituled to Kingly right of Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction, if the Kings had no Kingly Eccleſiaſticall right, or juriſdiction at all.

G.Powel. Breifely, the lawfullnes of they deprivation, of the refractary Miniſters, is a plaine caſe adjudged, in open Court, as appeareth in *S. Edward Cookes Report part 5 in Cawdries caſe* according to a Statute of *1. Elizab. cap 2. &c.*

Reply. It is a moſt playne and cleere caſe, that neither the caſe of *Cawdrie*, is the caſe of ſundry the late deprived Miniſters; nor that the caſe of ſundry the late deprived Miniſters, is the caſe of *Cawdrie*.

Con-

Cawdrie was deprived, not by his Ordinarie, but by the *Queenes Eccleſiaſticall* high Commiſsioners; not for not ſubſcribing to the 3 *Articles*; not for the not uſe of rits and Ceremonyes; not, for the not exact, and preciſe obſervation, of the booke of Common prayer: But as well, for that he had preached againſt, and depraved the ſaid book, as alſo for that he refuſed to celebrate divine ſervice, according to the ſayd booke.

S. Edward Cook de jure regis eccl. Cawdries caſe fol. 3

Agayne, in his cauſe, it being found before the High Commiſsioners, that he had uttered *verba convitioſa* and *contumelioſa*, convitious, and contumelious words, againſt the boke of Common prayer; the caſe was not, whither his fact were puniſhable by the Statute, (for of that no man then doubted;) but whether his depravation, and preaching againſt the booke of Common prayer, beyng the firſt offence committed by him againſt the Statute; he was puniſhable by tenor of the ſtatute, for the ſame his firſt offence, by depravatiō, yea or no? Laſtly *Cawdries* offence was puniſhable as well before the *Queenes Iuſtices* by impriſonment, and loſſe of one whole yeares profites, of his ſpirituall promotions, as by deprivation before his Ordinary. None of all which things, were within the cōpaſſ, of ſundry the late deprived Miniſters. For non of thē ever preached againſt the booke, nor depraved the ſame. They never refuſed to obſerue the ſame booke, according to the proeme of the booke & tenor of the ſtatute. They were ſo farr from claymyng any immunitie, from being depraved, for their firſt offence, as that they ſtood and yet doe ſtand, upon their innocencyes, not to haue committed any offence at all, againſt the ſtatute puniſhable with deprivation, by the ſtatute they alleadge, that they were not puniſhable before the Kings Iuſtices by the ſtatute,

looke ſent. a gainſt Caw.

for theſe facts which they were charged by their Ordinaries to haue committed againſt the ſtatute, and for which they were deprived. Laſtly, ſome of them were deprived not for any fact done, committed, or perpetrated: but for not promiſing heereafter, to obſerue the whole booke. And what an unconſiderate part therefore is it, to avowe the lawfulnes of the deprivation of all the late ſilenced Miniſters, to be a playne caſe adjudged in open Court; when neither their caſe, nor any like caſe to ſom of theirs, was ever yet brought or argued before the Kings Iuſtices in any of the Kings open courts at all.

Touching the ſtatut alleadged, 1. *Elizabeth*, it helpeth nowhitt at all the late deprivations of ſundry Miniſters, Firſt, becauſe ſuch Miniſters as haue been deprived onely for not conformyng themſelues, to the uſe of the booke provided by the pariſhioners cannot truly be charged to haue refuſed the booke commaunded by the ſtatute. Becauſe the ſame booke was never provided for them. Secondly, the ſtatute puniſheth not every refuſer, but wilfull and obſtinate refuſers. They then that upon conſcience onely of Gods word, doe refuſe to obſerue althings conteyned in the booke, cannot be iuſtly called obſtinate refuſers, till their groundes out of the word, be by the word removed. Thirdly, the ſtatute requyreth ſome Act, done, committed or perpretrated againſt the Statut: but ſome Miniſters haue been deprived only for not promiſing &c: as before was ſayd. Fourthly, the ſtatute appoynteth the Ordinaries to proceed by inquiſition, accuſation, or information: But many of us haue been deprived without any of theſe meanes, and onely npon *Proces, Ex officio mero*. Heerby therfore appeareth, how unjuſtly, and directly contrary to the words of the ſtatute, you inſert

ſert this Parentheſis,(which they may doe *Ex officio*,)as if they might by vertue of this Statute proceed *Ex officio*, wheras the Statute expreſly requyres inquiſition,accuſation,or information. Is this good interpretation? If you doe ſo interprete the ſcripture direcly contrary to the wordes of ſcripture, in the ſame place you make but mad interpretations.

Touching that which is objected againſt all hitherto ſpoken in the poynt of the law,of the opinion of the Iudges to be againſt the ſame, may it pleaſe the reader toremember the ſaying of an Honorable and moſt renowned Counſeller in that behalfe,viz.that in ſuch caſes and all other, men are not ſo much to reſpect what judges ſpeake ſtanding bare headed, as what they ſay ſittyng upon the judgment ſeate, repreſenting the Kings perſon (yea not *executing the iudgment of man but of the Lord*)when all men ſtand bare headed before them. 2 chro: 19:6

Concernyng the oth *Ex officio*, we affirme that the law of the land is againſt the exerciſe of the ſame *oath*,by Ordinaries and other judges Eccleſiaſticall. of the othe ex officio

A

The Common law of this kingdome which is grounded upon the law of God,and of reaſon doth hate and abhorre it.

B

Firſt in reſpect of the fraylty of man who for the ſafitie of his life, libertie, credit, and good name, will not ſpare to prophane even that which is moſt holy, and by committing ſinfull perjury hazard his ſoule. which the ſubtle ſerpēt wel knew in generall though he were deceaved in the perticuler,in that he ſayd unto God concerning *Iobskinne for skinne, and whatſoever a man hath will he giue for himſelfe and for his life, but ſtretch out thy hand* (ſaith Sathan) *and touch his bones, and his fleeſh, and ſee if he will not then blaſ-*

pheme

C *pheme thee to thy face.* Secondly in respect of the feeblenes of the judgment and sentence, that shoulde be grounded upon the othe of such a party, being even then at his convention, aforehand defamed, and of suspected faith,

Bracton or credit.

D Agayne, it is against the common law which constātly holdeth that, *iudicium est in qualibet actione trinus actus trium personarum Iudicis, actoris, et rei. Secundum quod large accipi possunt huiusmodi personæ, quod duæ sunt ad minus inter quas vertatur contentio et tertia persona ad minus qui iudicet; alioquin non erit iudicium cum istæ personæ sunt partes principales in iudicio, sine quibus iudicium consistere non potest.*

Britton And the renowned Prince *King Edward* the first saith

E by the penn of the learned Iudg *Britton*, that no judgmēt may be of fewer, then three persons, that is to say; a *Iudge*, *a plantiefe*, and *a defendent*, and in case (saith the King) that we be a party, we will that our Court shall be Iudge.

F Then if the party convented be constrained to accuse himselfe, he susteineth two of the said parties in judgmēt, viz. *actoris et rei*, which the law hateth, or else the Ordinary or Iudge susteineth two of the sayde partyes in judgment, that is both Iudge and Promoter, which the law doth also abhorre.

G Therfore true judgment cannot so consist.

H If it be objected that common bruite and fame may lawfully stand in steead of an accuser, and put a person cō vented to purge himselfe therof, and to deliver his knowledge also of others by oeth; I answer that fame is *tam ficti pravique tenax quam nuncia veri*, and ought to haue no credit untill it be presented in course of law or proved, For the law is, that the Iudge himselfe (if he would of his owne knowledge affirme the party to be in famous) is

not

405

not to be received or beleeved. For that the law will, *quod secundum acta et probata iusticia ministretur.*

That which is often objected, that private relation made unto the Iudge, is sufficient to put the party convẽted to answer upon his oeth, is answered before; for that the parties in judgment must not be fayned persons but such as may stand upright in Court, and answer the party convented his damages and costs if his prosecution be wrongfull, otherwise a man may be greatly wronged, his good name and fame unjustly brought into question, put to great chardges without any recompence and malicious backbiting maintained, and all by coloure of this proceeding which the common law hateth. I

That which is objected (that if this course should not be taken by proceeding by oth *Ex officio mero*, vice would abound; for that accusation is daungerous, and odious,) is easily answered. That the commõ law seeth this also, and therefore hath ordeyned common enformers to proceed against such as private persons will not deale with by witnesses and such legall courses, and allow them part of the penaltie for their labor, and yet alloweth the party wrõgfully accused his damages and costs if the accusation be wrongfull and injurious. In so much as if the enformer will not, or be not able to render it, he shall receaue corporall punishment for his offence, and for the redemption of the defendant credit and reputation. K

The Statute law also is, that no fre man shalbe appre- 9:H: 3: c:29
hended or imprisoned, or to be disseased of his free hold, or liberties, or free customes, or to be outlawed or exiled, or any wise distroyed, nor we shall passe upon him, nor deale with him, but by lawfull judgment of his peeres or by the law of the land, that is by presentment, Indictmẽt,

106 witnes, verdict, voluntary confeſſion, or proceſſ of utlary.

In ſo much as when the Popiſh Clergie would neverleſſe be tampering with this oath *ex officio*, (as their practiſe was to be medling for the advancment of Antichriſt in all States) there was a writt of prohibition awarded, as warrented formerly by the Common law; to be directed to the *Sheriff* commaunding him that he ſhall not permit etc: and thereupon an attachment againſt the Biſhop if he diſobey:

2:H:4:c:15 After this in the height of the Popes pride in the dayes of *King Henrie* the 4. (who was willing to pleaſe him being a King in *facto*, but not *de iure*,) this oath crept in, as a *Canonicall ſanction*, by the ſtatute of 2.*H*.4.

25 h.8:c.14 23:H:8:c:9 But the iniquitie, injuſtice; and repugnancy thereof to the Common lawes & ſtatutes of the Realme appearing to the State, it was by *K.H.8*. by the whole Parliament abrogated as injurious to the Crowne, and utterly againſt the common juſtice of the kingdome and ſo it reſteth cõdempned to this day. So that no Ordinary can practiſe it by any power under the Crowne.

Then it followeth that the uſe therof muſt needs be by colour of the Canon law, which being in that poynt derogatory to the Crowne, repugnant to the law of this kingdome, and aboliſhed by Act of Parliament, it conſequently cannot be uſed, but by aforreine power and thẽ it is *premunire*.

25 h.8.c.19

wager of law And to that which is alleaged by the *Civilians*, that the Common law alloweth it in that, which is termed the *wager of law*, or doeing of his law, it appeareth that they are therin utterly miſtaken, which may eaſily ariſe out of their ignorance therof.

Firſt the *wager of law* is voluntary for he that offereth it

may

may be tried *per patriam* at his election; This is contrary viz. *extorted and constreined.*

2 The *wager of law* commeth from the certeine knowledge of the deponent, who best knoweth whither he ow the debt or not: This is contrary, most uncertaine, what shalbe demaunded or interrogated

3 Againe, the wager of law maketh an end of the strife; but this is contrary viz: the beginning of strife: for it is not finall, but frō thence the Iudge gathereth the ground wherupon to proceed against the party convented.

4 The wager of law is in case meere and onely civill, for an honest man may be in debt; but this othe is ministred in case meere criminall, in which case the othe is so much the more odious to the Common law, by how much it is an apparant occasion of perjury: which carnall men will rather fall into, then to subject themselues to corporall punishment, or to lay open their owne turpitude or shāe.

Neither can this proceeding by *othe ex officio* be foūd in the Honorable Court of Starr chamber. For although the courts of Starr chamber and Chauncery proceed not by Iury, yet they obserue the due forme of justice, and enforce no man to answer, but where he hath a knowne accuser and perfect understanding of the cause or crime objected, and therewithall is permitted to haue a copye of the bill of complaint or information, and allowed more over both time convenient and councell learned, well to consider & advise of his oth & answer, and if his adversaryes complaint, be either in sufficient in forme, or such as the Court hath no jurisdiction to determine, the defendant upon demurrer without othe is dismissed, and that with costs. And admtit the accusation be such as is every way aunswerable, yet if the interrogatoryes ministred be

Starr chāmber.

impertinent to the matter of complaint, the defendant without offence to the Court, may refuse to make answer to the same.

Therefore no similitude or likenes between this oth used in these Honorable courts of Iustice & that constreyned *oath ex mero officio Iudicis*.

1 Since the former sort be orderly taken in courts of justice, the other without all course of judgement.

2 The one where the plantiff and matter of complaint are manifest, the other where neither accuser nor matter of accusation doeth appeare, unlesse the bare suspicion of the Iudge, fame unproved, or private insinuation, may be allowed for competent persons in judgement, against whom the party defendāt is deprived of all legall exceptiōs, & is often, after great trouble dismissed and (though innocent) yet dampnified and slaundered and without recompence, there being no complanant found, but the Iudge himselfe.

3 The one made upon certaine knowledge and good advisment, the other soddenly without all discretion upon uncertaine demaunds.

4 The one wisely restreined to certaine limits & boūds the other foolishly wandring at the doubtfull will of a sly and subtill opposer.

5 Upon the one the deponent aunswereth to the accusation of his adversarye, by the other he is compelled to be his owne accuser and condemner.

6 The one requyreth an answer to matter in fact done either to the injury of some private person, or hurt of the publicke state, the other constreineth revealing of words, deeds, and thoughts though never offensiue to any.

That which is objected that the saide proceeding is war-

warranted by the *Canon law* or *Civill law*, is anſwered many wayes; but breifely by the *poſitiue law* it ſelfe, that baniſheth all *Canon Civill*, or other law, or preheminence, or power whatſoever, which is contrary or repugnant to the common law of the land; But this proceeding by the partyes owne *othe ex officio mero*, is contrary and repugnant to the common law of the land. *Ergo*

Thus we ſee that this proceeding by oth *ex officio* was a meere ſtraunger in England, and how it arrived heerein *Anno 2. H 4.* but yet as a masker, diſguiſed, marching in the rowte of *Cannonicall ſanctions* & obſcured from the veiw of the State under that name; but after being diſcovered as an adder in the graſſ, was damned and expelled, by the Statute of 25. *H.* 8. as a traytor to the King and his lawes, and hath no lawfull or warrantable interteynment by the ſtatute of *primo Elizab*, For that there by no jurisdiction excerciſed by the Biſhop of *Rome* in this kingdome is annexed to the crowne, but that which was then lawfnlly vſed and excerciſed within this kingdome: Conclusion:

Then, for any Ordinary or Iudge Eccleſiaſticall to enterteine it and uſe it in their courts & proceedings; is a high miſpriſion againſt the King his Crowne and dignity, and puniſhable by the Statute of the 16. yeere of *K. R. 2.*

Now to paſſe from the *oth ex officio*, to the *Canons*, and yet not to deale with thoſe that are of indifferent ſorte, but with thoſe onely, that are either contrary to Gods word, or repugnant to the lawes of the land, neither alſo to ſay all of theſe in this place, that might be ſayd, but only (for brevities ſake) to giue a taſt, and to poynt at ſome; may it pleaſe the Chriſtian reader, yea the anſwerer himſelfe, yea all our adverſaries in this cauſe (that are not too much blinded with mallice) to conſider, that all ſuch *Ca-* of the Canōs

nons generally as pronounce a man *ipso facto excommunicate*, for saying thus or thus, against the *Canons* themselues, against the Ceremonies, against the booke of Common prayer, and the strict obseruation thereof, etc: cannot be justified in this behalfe by the word of God. For as (to prevent an obiection that might be made from the commaundement for reading of them publikly in Churches) albeit the sacreed scriptures be dayly publikely read and preached, yet many things are both wittingly and unwillingly spoken, and actually committed, against the sayd sacreed scriptures, for which notwithstanding, such persons are not presently to be held *ipso facto excommunicate*: so certeinly (except the authoritie of the Church be greater then the authority of God, and the *Canons* of this last *Synod* more authenticall, *then the holy scriptures giuen by inspiration from God*,) it must be acknowledged of these Canons, and all other constitutions of the Church whatsoeuer, that every word spoken, or act committed against thē (especially unwittingly) is not so heavily to be punished.

Agayne, wheras the sayd *Canons*, doe forbid any man by speech so offending, without publike revocation, of his sayd (pretended) *wicked error, to be restored*: sith the sayd offence may be committed as well privatly, as publikely, and sith the Canons speake generally (*whosoever shall affirme etc*,) without any exception of private affirmations; how can the sayd Canons in this respect, be warranted by
1 Tim: 5. 1 the word of God? If all offences against Gods word, (at least of man against man) be not publikely to be reprehēded; much lesse are all affirmations in disgrace of any Ecclesiasticall cōstitutions of men, to be punished with publike pennance.

Furthermore whereas divers of the sayd Canons, doe for-

forbid many offenders by ſuch affirmations, to be reſtored by any other meanes, then onely by the *Archbiſhop*: ſith the ſayd offence may not onely be unwitting & private, but alſo by a poore ignorant man, yea perhaps a lame impotent man, dwelling alſo it may be an hundred myles, or almoſt 200. myles from the *Archbiſhop*. What equity is there, that ſvch an offender, ſhould be debarred from all reſtoring by any other? And ſo, for want therof, be deprived (perhaps all his life) from all publike communion with the Church, and from all ſpirituall comfort for his ſoule therby? Is this the mercy *that is better then ſacrifice?* And wherby we doe repreſent our heavenly Father?

The 13. *Canon* commaundeth the celebration of holy dayes, as well as of the Lords day, and that as equally agreyng to *Gods holy will and pleaſure*. I deny not, but that as Gods word is to be preached at all tymes, *in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon*, ſo it is alſo to be heard as oft as men haue opportunity: but yet that the holy dayes now commaunded to be celebrated, are as equally *according to Gods holy will and pleaſure*, as the Lords day (eſpecially ſo to be celebrated, as they are injoyned, with greater ſolemnities ſometimes then the Lords day it ſelfe,) this is contrary both to the 4 commaundement, and alſo to many other Scriptures, which condemne ſuch obſervation of dayes, and tymes. Gal: 4. 10: Coloſſ. 2. 16 The holy dayes alſo now commaunded to be kept, may be abrogated by the Magiſtrate, as wel as other, that were wont to be obſerved. But I hope, that although ſome are bold to ſay as much of the Lords day, yet our *Prelats* will not publikly allow of any ſuch raſh & impious opinion.

The 14. *Canon* commaunding all divine ſervice, preſcribed in the booke of common prayer to be read upon the dayes appoynted, *without any diminiſhyng in regard of*

112 *preaching or in any other respect*; is agaynst charity and consequently agaynst the word. For the weaknes of some mens body, at all tymes is such, that they are not able to reade all and to preach. At sometime also, the strongest man, may haue such an infirmity, that he may not be able to endure the performãce of both. In winter, many times the extremity of cold, will not permit the whole auditory, to continue so long at Church. Then (will some say,) let preaching by such persons as are so weake, or at such times, be omitted. This indeed is that which many would haue. But this is to ~~performe~~ reade bare reading before preaching: ignorance before knowledge: and the ordinances of man, before the commaundements of God.

The 18 *Canon* for bowing *at the mention of the name of Iesus*, is absurd in that respect: because the place whereon philip.2.10. it seemeth to be grounded, is not literally so to be understood. First for that it speaketh of things not only *in earth* but also *in heaven, and under the earth*, in which places ther are no *knees*. 2. It speaketh not onely of men, but also of all other creatures. For it saith *of all things*. By the literall interpretation therefore, all creatures *at the mention of the name of Iesus*, should bend their *knees*. 3. By this interpretation, no man must sit whilst any thing is read, that hath that name, or else he must rise at the mention thereof to bowe ~~their~~ *knee*. 4. It is superstition, to giue more reverence, to the name *Iesus* then to the name *Christ, God, Iehouah*, or the *Holy Ghost*. 5. If the *knee* be so to be bowed, at the name of *Iesus*, why not also at the name *Saviour*? For what doeth *Iesus* signifie but *Saviour*? 6. The place speaketh not of that which is due to the name, but of that which is due to the person of Iesus. So the *Canonists* are deceaved, with that fallacy, which is *a rebus ad voces*. 7. It

spea-

413

ſpeaketh of that which is due to him, as well in private, as in publike places: in our houſes, at our tables, in our beds: as we ſit, as we walke, as we ly: If then we ſit at table, or ly in our beds etc: we muſt not ſpeake of *Ieſus*, but we muſt ariſe to make a legge. Laſtly, this name *Ieſus*, is no more then *Ioſhua*, who therfore is called *Ieſus Act. 7. 45.* It is alſo the name of *Iozadak. Zech. 3. 1:* compared with *Eccleſiaſticus 49. 12:* and *Ezra 3. 2*: and of the Sonne of *Syrach:* and of one *Iuſtus Coloſſ. 4. 11.* The common people therefore for want of preaching and by their owne negligence, being ſo ignorant, that they cannot well diſcerne the name *Ieſus* our *Saviour* from the ſame name of other, they may miſtake themſelues and bowe the knee, as well at the mẽtion of other ſo named as of Ieſus our Lord and Saviour, and ſo ignorantly they ſhould commit blaſphemy. That which is ſaid for defence heerof by ſome, that we ſhould the rather bowe at this name, to teſtifie our hatred againſt *Arrianiſme*, is more dotage thẽ divinity: and therfore not worthy any anſwer. The *Deitie* of Chriſt is more manifeſt by other names, eſpecially by the name *Emmanuell*, then by the name *Ieſus*.

Touching the *Canons* for *Coapes*, *Surplices*, *Croſſe*, and other Conformitie, as alſo touching the preſent *Hierarchie*, and manner of ordaynyng *Archbiſhops*, *Biſhops*, *Preiſts*, *Deacons*, *etc:* and for *Subſcription*; it is too long in this place, to ſet downe perticular reaſons againſt them. Therfore I referr the reader to perticular treatiſes of thoſe things, both hertofore, and alſo lately written.

The 49. *Canon*, for no Miniſter to preach or expound any Scripture or matter of doctrine, without a ſpeciall licence in that behalfe; is a moſt lamentable contrariety to the word, which commaundeth every Miniſter, both to

414 be *apt to teach*, and *to teach indeede*. And I would gladly know of ſuch *Canon*-makers, whither thoſe that they call by the name of Miniſters, be Miniſters of the word or no? If they be Miniſters of the word, ſhall they not haue power to expound and preach the word by vertue of the ſaid Miniſtery? Yea, doe not they themſelues, when they ordayne them Miniſters, bid them *take power to preach the word?* It is yet more lamentable in the ſayde *Canon*, that they commaund all Miniſters (not ſpecially licenſed, to preach or expound in their owne chardges) onely *to ſtudy to read plainely and aptly (without glozing or adding) the Homilies already ſet forth, or heerafter to be publiſhed etc.* For doe not theſe words plainely import, that ſome Miniſters are not able to read without ſtudiyng for it, even after they be made Miniſters? Yea, doe not the words (*onely to ſtudy to read plainely and aptly the Homilies etc.*) implye a precept againſt ſtudiyng to read the ſcriptures, which are harder then Homileis: eſpecially againſt ſtudiyng to preach heer after? O miſerable condition then of ſuch people, as haue ſuch Miniſters as muſt goe to ſchoole to learne to read the Homilies, not the ſcriptures, yea and which muſt not ſtudy at all ever to Preach.

The 53. *Canon* againſt confuting of any publike doctrine (how hereticall or dangerous ſo ever) before the *Biſhop* be made acquainted with the ſaid doctrine; is moſt prejudiciall to the ſalvation of the hearers of ſuch erroneous teaching. For the ſoules of men beyng by nature as capable of any errors, as their bodyes are of any infectious diſeaſe; and the Biſhop of the ſame Dioceſſe, ſometime perhaps dwelling or beynge an hundred myles from the Church, wherein ſuch errors were delivered; and the life of man being moſt uncertaine; and Biſhops themſelues

being ſometime erroneous, and therefore not very haſtie to haue errors confuted: may not many a ſoule be infected with ſuch error, yea, and dye in them, before any remedy can be had againſt them?

415

This ſhall ſuffice for a taſt of the contrariety of divers *Canons*, to Gods word. If I ſhould perticularly runne over other, that haue like cõtrariety; this volume would much exceed, both my owne purpoſe, and alſo the likyng of all readers.

Before I proceed to the *Canons* repugnant to the lawes of the land; let me here interlace one reaſon in a word generally to proue, both the *Canons* and alſo the booke of *Common prayer* (now impoſed upon Miniſters,) not yet to be eſtabliſhed by law, and ſo conſequently all the proceedings of the Prelats againſt the ſaid Miniſters for not ſubſcribyng, obſerving the booke, conformity etc, to be without law, and againſt law. This one reaſon, is from the late Bill of the *Biſhops* preſented to the *Parliament* for the eſtabliſhing both of the booke of *Common prayer*, and alſo of their *Canons*. For if the ſaid booke and *Canons* were already good in law; what needed any new ſtatute to eſtabliſh them? If they ſay *that abundans cautela non nocet, plentifull caution is not hurtfull*, they muſt alſo remember, that they haue likewiſe learned, *fruſtra fit per plura, quod fieri poteſt per pauciora: It is in vayne to doe that by many thinges, which may be done by fewe.*

Now to the *Canons* repugnant to the law.

We decree and appoynt (ſaith the Synod) *that no iudge, ad quem, ſhall admitt or allow any his or their appeales* (ſpeaking as they call them of obſtinate and factious appellants) *unleſſe he haue firſt ſeene the originall appeale. But the King* (*ſay I*) *is a iudge ad quem. Ergo, the King* (ſaith this Synod) *may*

not admitt or allow any appeale etc. The liberty, and franchiſe then of the Kings will, and grace, after this unwonted manner, (by a *Synodall* decree onely) beyng thus blemiſhed, impeched, and reſtrayned; what dignity, prehemiſnence, ſuperiority, or prerogatiue, hath the Kings grace, when the King himſelfe is chardged, not to grant any inhibition out of his Court of *Chauncery*, but conditionally and upon *an unleſſe etc.*

And if by this *Canon*, the Kings will and grace, receiue let, hinderance, and prejudice; what ſhould we thinke, but that this *Canon* alſo tendeth, to the weakenyng of the Kings arme and power? For how can his power be ſtrõg, and his arme able to help, when his grace is bound, and his will, unable to will?

And then agayne, if theſe two mayne pillars of his Majeſties prerogatiue Royall (namely his grace and his power) be thus ſhaken by this *Canon*, muſt it not neceſſarily follow, that the Lords and Commons in Parliament, are prejudiced therby? For the rights & prerogatiues, of the Kings Crowne, by the lawes of the Realme, be not inveſted, and appropried, unto the Kings perſon, onely in regard of his Majeſties owne Royall eſtate; but alſo for the good condition, and preſervation of his body Politicke, which is the Common wealth. Which body alſo for the juſt, and neceſſary defence both of the head (which is the King) and of it ſelfe, hath ſuch a proper clayme, and intereſt, in, and to the grace, and power of the head, as the leſt jote of the power and grace of the head, may not be blemiſhed to the prejudice of the body, without conſent of the body. viz: of the Lords & Commons in Parliament, who are the very image, and true repreſentiue body of the Realme: yea and thus much in effect, haue the Kings

pro-

progenitors,and the Aunceſtors of our Nobles,and Cõmons agreed upon in Parliament;when by their authority and conſent, it was forbidden, that any thing ſhould be attempted, which ſhould tend, to the blemiſhyng of the Kings prerogatiue,or to the prejudice of his Lords & Commons. And when alſo, by common conſent, it was enacted in effect, that neither King *Iohn*, nor any other King, could bring his Realme and people in thraledome, and ſubjection,but by conſent in Parliament. Acts & Monuments 4: Ed.3 pag 422.424:

Furthermore appeales beyng *de iure naturali*,and introduced into judgement ſeats, *tam ob defenſionem et preſidiũ innocentiæ, quam ad deprimendam iniquitatem, et corrigendam imperitiam iudicis*; as well for the defence and ſavegard of innocency,as for the depreſsing of the iniquity, and correcting the unskilfulnes of a Iudge, as they haue been evermore allowed by the lawes,& cuſtões of the Realme, ſo haue they been ſuffered, as freely to be proſecuted, as interpoſed. For otherwiſe, how ſhould either innocency be protected, or the injuſtice of a judge reformed, in caſe an appeale being interpoſed, might not be proſecuted, *fruſtra*(ſaith S.Edward Cooke)*expectatur eventus, cuius effectus nullus ſequitur*. de jure Reg Eccleſ.

And according unto this naturall equity,hath it been ſpecially provided by a Statute of the realme, that the Kings ſubjects,being greived,ſhould not only haue libertie, to make, but alſo, to take, haue, uſe, and proſecute all manner of appeales,after ſuch manner, forme,and condition,as is limited,for appeales, to be had,and proſecuted. And for lacke of Iuſtice in many Courts of the *Archbiſhops* of this Realme, it is lawfull for the partie greived, to appeale to the Kinges Majeſtie in his Court of *Chauncery*. And upon every ſuch appeale, a Commiſſion (ſaith the

Statute) ſhalbe directed under the great Seale, to ſuch perſons, as ſhalbe named by the Kings Highnes, to heare and definitivly determine ſuch appeales, with the cauſes, and all circumſtances. It is therefore apparant, that this *Canon*, is contrary or repugnant to this Statute. For this *Canon*, and this ſtatute thus repugnantly providing, and working divers repugnant effects, the ſtatute ſimply, admitting the uſe and proſecution of all manner of appeales, the *Canon* not admittyng but conditionally the uſe and proſecution of ſome appeales; can not ſtand together.

Agayne, ſome inferiour Ordinaryes having libertie, to take the bridle in their owne teeth, & to lay the reynes looſe, on their owne neckes, may in tyme (beyng proudly pampred) wax wanton in their judgement ſeates; when they ſhall ſtand in no awe, of having, the nullitie or injquity of their proceſſ and ſentences, weyed in the ballance of any ſuperiour Iudge. By reaſon whereof, this *Canon*, can not but proue exceeding onerovs to the ſubject.

For let a man or woman, dwelling at *Michaels Mount*, be but once judicially, (though perhaps wrongfully) cited by the name of a factious or obſtinat perſon, & cõtemner of ceremonyes, and from ſuch wrongfull citations, let his, or her appeale, made to the Kings Majeſtie in his Court of *Chauncery* (if it be frõ the *Archbishop*,) or unto the *Archbishop* (if it be from the *Dioceſan*) be never ſo juſt, & equal, thereis no remedy in this caſe, before his, or hirs appeale, be admitted or allowed, but the ſame man or woman (by the letter of this *Canon*) muſt perſonally appeare, in the *Archbishops Conſiſtory*, if the appeale be by the *Archbishop*, and if the appeale be to the King in the Kings Court of *Chauncery*, though the ſame ſhould be at *Barwicke*. Yea, and though the party appellant be never ſo poore, aged, weake,

419.

weake, and impotent. Nay not only personall appearãce, but personall subscription also, by this *Canon* is requyred, to the Kings Supremacie, to the Articles of Religion, to the booke of Homilies, to the booke of Common prayer, and to the booke of Consecrating *Bishops*, be the party appellant, never so simple a laborer, or never so silly a spister.

The *37. Canon* disauthorizeth every Minister by what authority so ever he be admitted, to preach, or to read a Lecture in any place within the Realme, unlesse he be licenced, either by the *Archbishop*, or by the *Bishop* of the *Dioceſſ*, or by one of the two Universities under their hands and seale. Let the King then under his broad seale, graunt licence to any of his Chapleines to preach within his owne chapple, this licenc by this *Canon*, is of no value; then the which what can be more derogatory, to the Soveraigne dignity of the King in causes *Ecclesiasticall*?

Unto the mould of this *Canon*, agreeth the 47. *Canon*, (before mẽtiõed) which cõcludeth, that no Minister not licẽsed a Preacher, under the hand & seale of the *Bishop* of the *Dioceſſ*, or *Archbishop* of the *Province*, or under the seale of one of the Vniversities, shall take upon him to expound, in his owne cure any scripture, or matter of doctrine, but shall onely study *to read playnely, and aptly, without glosing or addyng, the Homilies already set forth, or heerafter to be published by lawfull authority*. The King then by this Canon, may not licence, a Minister to preach or to expound any scripture, no not in his own cure, no though the ministers Cure, be the Kings owne houshold, or the houshould of the Prince, or any other of the Kings children. Nay by these two *Canons* and the *Canon* of subscription it is evident, that the *Prelats* intended, that every *Scotish* Minister havyng renounced the *Hierachie*, and embraced the single

forme of Goverment in *Scotland*, ſhould be barred from preaching at any time before the King in England, unleſſ he ſhould ſubſcribe to the *Hierarchy* of *England*. For with out a licence may none preach, and without ſubſcription may none be licenced.

And not onely is this 47. *Canon*, derogatorie to the Kings prerogatiue, but it is alſo repugnant, to other the Kings lawes and ſtatuts. For whereby that ſtatute, made againſt *Lolardy*, and *Hereſie*,, it was enacted, that none ſhould preſume to Preach openly, or privily, without the licence of the Dioceſan, firſt requyred & obtayned, yet by the ſame Act, Curats in their owne Churches, and Parſons priviledged were excepted, and by the Provinciall Conſtitutions, confirmed and ratified by Parliament, it is provided thus: *We eſtablish, that no ſecular, or regular, not authoriſed by written law, or protected by ſpeciall priviledg, to preach the word of God, may take upon him the preaching or exerciſe of the ſame word, within any Church, or without any Church, unleſſ firſt he preſent and ſubmit himſelfe, to the examination of the Dioceſan etc: But concernyng a perpetuall* Curate, *we underſtand ſuch a one, by law and right to be ſent to the place, and people of his Cure.* And that we may underſtand whom the Canon meaneth, to be a perpetuall Curate the gloſſ ſheweth us, *that a Biſhop in his Dioceſſ, a Parſon and Vicar in his Parish, and every other Perſon intituled, to any benefice whereunto apperteyneth cure of ſoules*, is to be underſtood to be a perpetuall Curate, and that he may preach in his owne Cure, without the Biſhops licence.

Moreover by the booke of ordering Biſhops, Miniſters, and Deacons, every one made a Miniſter, promiſeth *that he will giue all faithfull diligence alwayes, to miniſter the doctrine etc: as the Lord hath commanded etc: ſo that he will*

teach

teach the people committed to his cure and chardg, withall dilli- 421
gence to keepe and obſerue the ſame. But how can a Miniſter inſtruct and teach the people committed to his chardge, according to his publicke vowe, if (as it is ſayd in this *Canon*) he ſhall not take upon him to expound in his owne Cure, any ſcripture or matter of doctrine at all, but ſhall onely ſtudy to read plainely and aptly, (without gloſing or adding) the Homilies etc?

Laſtly, the wordes of the Biſhops inſtitution are theſe. *Teque rectorem eiuſdem, ac de, et ineadem inſtituimus canonice, et inveſtimus, cum ſuis iuribus, et pertinentiis univerſis, curamque et regimen animarum prochianorum ibidem in Domino cõmittimus per-preſentes.* And we (ſpeaking of a Clarke to be inſtituted into a benefice) Canonically inſtitute thee rector of the ſame Church, and of, and in the ſame doe inveſt thee, withall her rights & appertinances; and by theſe preſents, we in the Lord commit unto thee both the cure and goverment, of the ſoules of the Pariſhioners in that place. The Clearke then inſtituted into a benefice, by theſe wordes of the Biſhops inſtitution, by the booke of ordering of Biſhops, Miniſters, and Deacons, and by the Provinciall Conſtitutions, having not a private, but a publicke office, of cure and regiment of ſoules, committed unto him; how can it ſeeme reaſonable, that he ſhould be countermanded by reaſon of a Provinciall decree not cõfirmed by Act of Parliament, not to excerciſe the ſame his pnblicke otfice, without a Biſhops licence? For what if the Biſhops refuſe to grant him a licence? Or what if the Biſhops and his officers fee, for graunting, writing, & ſealyng his licence be greater then the poore Miniſter is able to disburſt, is it reaſon that his chardg by this meães ſhould be left uninſtructed? Nay is it not, as if a *Sergiant*

Cure & goverment by law ought to go together in a miniſter

at law, called to the barr of the Common pleas, by the Kings writ, ſolemly created a *Sergiant*, and publickly admitted to the ſame barr, ſhould afterward be forbidden by the cheife Iuſtice of that Court, to pleade at that barr, without licence otteyned, under his hand and ſeale? Or is it not, as if a Doctor of *Phiſicke*, ſolemnely created in the *Vniverſity*, and publickly admited to practiſe *artem medicã*, ſhould notwithſtanding, without a new faculty from the *Doctor* of the *Chayre* be inhibited, to miniſter any *Pill*, or *Portion*, to any pacient?

The 53. *Canon*, before alſo mentioned, viz. *againſt publicke oppoſition between preachers*, is not only repugnãt to the doctrine of (a) holy Scripture, & cõtrary to the practis of the (b) *Prophets* & *Apoſtles*, but alſo croſſeth the Miniſters vow ſolemly made at his ordination. Whoſe promiſe is that he wilbe ready, with all faithfull diligence, to baniſh, & driue away, all erroneous, and ſtrang doctrin contrary to Gods word, and to uſe both publicke, and private motions, and exhortations, as well to the ſicke as to the whole within his cure. But upon occaſion given, by any falſe Prophet, publickly broaching falſe doctrine, in a Miniſters chardg, how ſhall the Miniſter with all faithfull dilligence drive away the ſame falſe doctrine, and publickely teach the truth, if he may not teach, admoniſh, or exhort his people, without a licence firſt obtayned from the Biſhop of the *Dioceſſe*? For what if the Biſhop be upon an embaſſadg in *Denmarke*? Or what if the *Bishop* himſelf be of the ſame judgment with the falſe teacher?

a) levit 5. 1
2 Tim. 4. 2:
b) 2. Chron. 18. 7
Ierem. 27. 9 & 28: 7
Acts 13. 10.
Galat. 2: 11

The 91. *Canon* entituled *Parish Clearks to be choſen by the Miniſters*, is contrary and regugnant to the cuſtomes of the Realme, in many Pariſhes of the Realme. And in this regard, this *Canon* hath been blowen to peeces, at the barr

of

of the Common Pleas, by the opinion of the whole bēch in *Hylarie* terme laſt: when upon a writt of prohibition, procured by certayne Pariſhioners, in the Countie of *Hertford*, the Iudges denyed a conſultation, to the Miniſter of the ſame Pariſh, who had convented the Pariſhioners, before the *Eccleſiaſticall Iudg*, for gaynſaying his election of the pariſh cleark; which by vertue of this *Canon*, he had declared in the *Eccleſiaſticall Court*, to belong unto himſelfe a lone.

The 77. *Canon* entituled, *none to teach ſchole without licence*, is repugnant to a ſtatute made the firſt Seſſion of this Parliament in divers poyntse. Firſt the ſtatute permitteth a-ſcholemaſter to teach, in any publicke free grāmer ſchole, without any licence of the Biſhop of the Dioceſſ; or Ordinary of the place: but this *Canon* commaundeth, that none teach publicke ſchole, but ſuch as ſhalbe licenſed by the one; or by the other. Secondly, the ſtatute permitteth any perſon, in any Noble mans or Noble womans; gentle mans or gētlewomās houſe, being not recuſants, to teach without any licence of etc: but this *Canon*, commaundeth that no man ſhal teach in privat houſe, but by licence etc. Thirdly, the ſtatute permitteth not any perſon to be a-ſcholemaſter by any other licence, thē by the *Archbishop Biſhop*, or *guardian* of the ſpiritualties. But this *Canon* permitteth a ſcholemaſter to teach, if he be allowed by an Ordinarie of the place a lone. Which many tymes, and in many places, is neither *Archbishop*, nor *Biſhop*, nor *guardian* of the ſpiritualties.

Laſtly, this *Canon* commaundeth, that none teach in publicke ſchole, or private houſe, unleſſ he firſt ſubſcribe, to the firſt and third articles, mencioned in the 36. *Canon* ſimply, and to the two firſt clauſes of the ſecond article,

wheras the ſtatute requyreth no manner of ſubſcription at all.

All theſe things before written conſidered, we may ſafly affirme concernyng many of the ſaid late *Canons*, that they be not to be put in execution within the Realme, unleſſ they ſhall be confirmed by Act of Parliament: yea that we may alſo truely ſpeake this in generalitie: that eiall the Churcwardens and ſyde men throughout *England* ſworne to preſent all offences committed againſt the ſaid *Canons*, muſt be falſely perjured; or elſe that there is not one Miniſter which ſhall exerciſe his miniſteriall functiō, nor any one man, or woman, which ſhall uſually come to common prayer, and diuine ſervice, but they muſt ſtand continually at the Ordinaries mercy, for one offence or o ther. For the thinges commaunded, or forbidden, beyng innumerable, and imposſible at all tymes to be kept, into what a ſervitude theſe *Canons* haue brought both Miniſters and people, and what an excesſiue chardg, is layd up on the purſe of every perſon be he bond or be he free, be he yong, or be he old, for citations, Excommunications, abſolutions, and dimisſions, licences, faculties, and diſpēſations, Who havyng but halfe an eye ſeeth not? Nay, that many, in many places, haue already borne the Yoke, and felt the burden of theſe Canons, cannot be denyed. Agayne, howſoever at the petition of the Prelats, his Majeſtie hath been pleaſed generally to allow, ratifie and cōfirme, the booke of *Canons*, under the broad ſeale of *England*; yet may no loyall and honeſt ſubject heereupon inferr, that his Majeſtie intended by the generall wordes of his confirmation, to authorize any perticular matter, deviſed and decreed, by the *Synod*, contrary to the holy ſcriptures, hurtfull to the rights, prerogatives, and dignities, of his

his Highnes Crowne; repugnant to any lawes, ſtatuts, or cuſtomes of the Realme, prejudiciall to his Lords & commons in Parliament, or onerous to his people. The contents then of ſondry the late Canons, in as much as the ſame be contrary to the holy ſcriptures, tend to the blemiſhing of the liberty and franchiſe of the Kings will, grace, & power, be cõtrariant, or regugnant, to the lawes, ſtatuts, and cuſtomes of the Realme, be prejudiciall to the Lords, and Commons in Parliament, without whoſe conſent, no new bindyng law, ought to be made, or be ſuch, as may become very onerous to the people; it is a playne caſe, that every of the Kings liege & faithfull ſubjects, ought to defend the Kings right, Honor and dignity againſt all ſuch Canons. 425

For heerby it ſeemeth that as all other the wiſeſt and beſt Princes that ever haue been, haue in ſome things at ſome tymes erred, ſo we without offence (I hope) may ſay, that the King alſo *veritate tacita*, or *falſitate expreſſa*, was unawares ſomewhat miſtaken in his graunt. In regard whereof, ſuch Canons, by the lawes, ſtatuts, and cuſtomes of his kingdome be meerely voyd, and of none effect to all conſtructions & purpoſes: whereupon alſo, that neceſſarily followeth, that the ſame can receive no beyng, by his, Majeſties confirmation. *Quod omnino, non eſt, confirmari non poteſt.*

THE 9 ARGVMENT.

God hath promiſed to recompence the leaſt kindnes ſhewed to his ſervants, eſpecially to the Miniſters of the Goſpell. And the ſame God is not unrightcous to forget etc: but faithfull, and hath al vayes performed his promiſe, as appeareth by divers examples. Heb. 6: 10 and 10. 23:

Ergo: *In this regard the High Court of Parliament ought the more to help and releeue the Miniſters pleaded for, and the peo-*

426 *ple depending upon them.*

Marginall notes.

G. Powel a Miniſters are to be rewarded as they be ſuch, and in their office: but not as they be Schiſmatikes, and diſturbers of the peace of the Church.

Reply. Thereis a ſecret contradiction in the firſt parte of this anſwer. For as a Mayor ovt of his office is no Mayor, ſo a Miniſter out of his miniſtery is no Miniſter. See the anſwerer at large. Secondly, Miniſters violently thruſt out without juſt cauſe, are not to be blamed. Touching diſturbance, we ſay that not we, but the *Prelats* that plead for *humane* and *Romiſh Ceremonyes* (much hurtfull and nothing profitable,) are they that trouble the Church. For the Church would otherwiſe be quyet inough.

G. Powel b *Arcadian wiſdome.* The place Math. *11.11.* is to be underſtood not in regard of the office, but in reſpect of the cleare knowledg they ſhould haue of Chriſt, after his reſurrection.

Reply. The firſt part of this *note* beyng but a ſcorne I leaue to ſcorners. The other divinity of this *note*, is very deepe and profound. How ſhall I ſound the bottome of it? Doth *Chriſt* ſpeake of *Iohn*, in reſpect of his knowledge, or of his office? Did the people goe *out into the wildernes unto Iohn*, in reſpect of his knowledge, or in reſpect of his office, *to be baptiſed of him?* Doth *Chriſt* alſo aske whether the knowledge, *or the baptiſme*, (that is the miniſtery) *of Iohn were frō heaven or of men?* Heerby it is manifeſt that *Chriſt* compareth *Iohn* with the Prophets in reſpect of office, not in reſpect of knowledge. Therefore alſo in the ſame reſpect he compareth the leaſt in the kingdom of heaven with him, and preferreth the leaſt Miniſter of the goſpell for his miniſteryes ſake as much before *Iohn*, as he had before preferred *Iohn* before the Prophets.

Math. 3.6.7

Math 21.25

Laſtly, the miniſtery of the goſpell is greater then the know-

knowledge of the goſpell, becauſe it is both the end for which God giveth more knowledge to ſome then to other, and alſo the cauſe that worketh knowledge in other. If therfore the leaſt in the kingdome of heaven, be greater thē *Iohn Baptiſt* in reſpect of knowledg, which is the leaſt, then much more is the leaſt miniſter of the goſpell greater then *Iohn Baptiſt*, in reſpect of his miniſtery which is the greater. The note with (c) is not worth a *Cee* (as they ſpeake at *Oxford*) of ſingle beere.

427

Further anſwer to the 9. Argument.

G. Powel He doth any kindnes to a Miniſter, as he is a miniſter, ſhall haue reward. But if a Miniſter doe otherwiſe then he ought (as theſe refractaries doe) what kindnes then ought ſuch to haue?

Reply. What a multitude of conformable Miniſters are quite overthrowne by this Argument? For doe not many of them otherwiſe then they ought? Yea, doe not more of them otherwiſe, then all thes now in queſtion? Is not this ſo to ſtand in a gap, as that the gap is troden downe, and a dore opened, for all men to deny all duety to all Miniſters? For who doth not otherwiſe, thē he ought to doe?

G. Powel Let the refractary Miniſters duetifully ſerue God and his Church, in their diligent and humble obeydience, in the worke of their vocation. Then let them ſupplicat for kindnes etc.

Reply. What is that dilligent and humble obedience etc? To put on a *Surplice*, to make a vaniſhing *Croſſ*, to read *ſervice*, to acknowledge the *Prelats* to haue power to make ordinances againſt Gods word etc. How ſhall they ſupplicat? With an 100. or 200. in a bagge. Then perhaps if they ariſe betymes, and ryde a paſe, they ſhall haue a payre of benefices; an *Archdeconry* etc: yea liberty alſo to goe whither they will, & never to come at any of their benefices, but only in gathering time or if they lie at one of their benefices they ſhall haue leaue I to ſuſpēd themſelues from

428 preaching as long as the liſt: yea to do what elſe they will without controllment, ſo it be not againſt conformity. Notwithſtanding the *Canon* for halfe yeares reſidence at either of their livinges, they haue many quirkes to avoyd the danger therof.

THE 10. ARGVMENT.

The Lord hath forbidden all wrong to any of his ſervants, eſpecially to Miniſters. He threateneth alſo to revenge the leaſt in-
pſal. 105.15 *iury done unto them: and performeth that which he hath threa-*
exod. 17.14 15. *tned. Neither doth he account them onely guiltie of the former*
1. Sam. 15.3 *fault, that doe his people any hurt, but thoſe alſo that doe not help*
Iudg. 5.23. *in their need. Ergo The high Court of Parliament, ought to take the preſent opportunitie for releeving the Miniſters moleſted.*

The marginall notes of this Argument conteyne nothing but a vayne repetition of matters before noted and anſwered; they conteyne nothing, but that we are *Schiſmatiks, falſe prophets etc: cruell,* in forſaking our charges for litle or nothing etc. I doe therfore diſmiſſe them, with admiration, as of the notaryes barrenes and folly, ſo alſo of the virtue of *Croſſ* and *Surplice*. As the *Epheſians* cryed out of their Diana, *Great is Diana of the Epheſians*; ſo ſay I, *great*
Acts 19.28: *are Croſſ and Surplice of the Conformitans.* The uſe of them, maketh men Gods, Prophets, true prophets, peaceable men, faithfull Miniſters: but the refuſall of them makes men ſchiſmaticall, cruell, ſuperſtitious, falſe prophets etc. Who would not be in loue with them, wherein there is ſuch excellent virtue? How many may more truely ſacri-
Habba. 1.16 fice to them; then ſome ſometymes are ſayd to haue ſacrificed to their nets?

Further anſwer to the 10. Argument.

G. Powel It is an ungratfull, yea an ungracious parte of theſe ſupplicants, to taxe the Honorable aſſembly, or any Megiſtrate in this land ſo undu-

fully

429

tifully and unchriſtiantly, for unjuſt, cruell and mercileſſe dealyng.

Who doth ſo taxe them? Doth every one that admoniſh other of that which God forbiddeth or threatneth, taxe them whom he doth ſo admoniſh of thoſe faultes that are forbidden? Your ſelfe haue taxed them indeede before, of matters nothing beſeemyng you: yea, and the Prelats doe dayly taxe (if not alſo threathen to excommunicate them) for dealyng ſo much for us: for oppoſing themſelues ſo much to the Prelacy: for doeyng ſo much as they haue doone againſt *non reſidency, the diſorders of the high Commiſſion, the abuſe of citations, the horrible abuſe of the great cenſure of the Church, Excommunication etc:* yea for dealing at all in the matters of religion: yea, haue they not more ſtoutly then wiſely ſent out their *Inhibition* againſt them in that behalfe? Thus they may doe what they liſt, as though *their tongues were their owne*, and there were *no Lord over them*: but we poore men oppreſſed by them, may not humbly petition to the Parliament, but that we are preſently exclaymed of, *as ungratefull and ungracious, & as undutifully and unchriſtiantly taxeyng them for uniuſt, cruell and merciles dealyng*. Wherefore doe they thus charge us? Becauſe they feare that we will lay the ſame thinges to their charge. But though they doe thus eſteeme of our petition, yet we hope it is better accepted of the Honorable Courte, unto which it was directed.

Reply

Pſal: 12

Wheras in the reſt of the anſwer to this 10. Argumẽt, he ſayth the refractary Miniſters (as he calleth them) *were never proceeded againſt for preachyng the goſpell, or for apportune & ſober executyng their Miniſtery*, this is utterly untrue, for ſome haue been moleſted for preachyng any thinge tendyng againſt the preſent *Hierarchy*, or any other corruptions: ſome alſo for confuting the Popiſh doctrine of

other, though they haue doone it never so soberly: and some for other matters, which are poyntes of the gospell as well as other.

THE 11 ARGVMENT.

Pharao *in the great Egiptian famine, at his owne cost pro-*
Gen: 47: 22 *vided for all his Idolatrous priests, that they might not sell their lands. The* Monks, *and* Fryars *in Popery (yet in the twylight of the gospell) at the dissolution of the* Abbyes, *were provided for, duryng their life tyme.* Ergo, *The high Court of Parliament, in this cleare light of the gospell, ought much more to provide that the ministers of the gospell, may not be turned out a beggyng with their wiues and children, as they are; when all other haue their fill.*

The Marginall Notes.

G. Powel e VVhere superstition sitteth Iudge, there neyther nature, nor reason may dare to plead the cause. Alas, it is very lamentable, that some men (I know not for what carnall respects) had rather curry fayour with other, and beholding to other men, thē conscionably liue of their owne. They should well consider the saying of the Apost 1: Tim. 5. 8.

Reply. In divine matters, neither superstition must sit Iudge, neyther must things be pleaded by nature or reason, but all must be done by the word of God, the store house of divinity. They are superstitious, that stryue more for reteyning and practising of humane Ceremonyes in the worship of God, (be the pretense what it will) then they regard the truth of God. The (answerer as a very pitifull man) cryeth out, *Alas it is lamentable etc.* But one of these poore Ministers, yea many of them by reason of their troubles, may come ten-tymes to some of his great Masters houses, and not be offred once to drinke of a cupe: but the truth is, they haue forgotten Apostolicall hospitality, and they haue learned Lordly Episcopall hostility. Further marke here his contradiction, or oblivion. Before in his

his consideration of the preface to the Arguments, he hath expresly charged them with divers particular carnall respects, etc. Now he sayth, that *he knoweth not for what carnall respects they curry favour etc.* As for currying of favour; it belongeth rather to some hungry trencher chaplines, then to those against whom he writeth. Yea, as *Shimei* that cursed *David* when his kingdome was somwhat doubtfull, yet at his safe returne and reestablishing of the Crowne unto him, was as forward as any other, by creepyng and crouchyng, by flattering and fawnyng to curry favour agayne with David, so it is well if there haue been no such curryers of favor among the Prelats. The place of *Timothy* is abused. It might in like sort haue been applyed to all the Martyrs. We must not provide for our familyes by doyng any thing against Gods word. That we had rather liue of our owne, then of other mens, is manifest in that we doe so earnestly sue to be restored to our places, the rather that we may not be chargable to other.

contradictiō

2 Sam. 16. 13

2 Sam: 19 18

G. Powel

b Alas let them haue pity upon themselues, and leaue their quarreling, and they shall not be neglected.

Reply.

This is spoken more like an *Archbishop* that had power to preferre other, then like a young chapline that needed and wayted for preferment himselfe. I know not, who may more justly be charged with quarrelling, then they that beate and buffet their fellow servants: yea then they *that smite Christs Syster, his loue, his Doue, his undefiled*, yea, not only *smite her*, but also *woūd her, and take her vayle from her*. We would gladly liue in peace, (with holines) but we cannot be suffered.

Further answer to the 11. *Argument.*

G. Powel

The Argument doth not follow, because of the dissimilitude in the instances, or examples:

Reply.

The Argument doth follow the better, because of the dis-

ſimilitude of inſtances (as the anſwerer ſpeaketh) or rather becauſe it is a *minore ad maius*, from the leſſe to the greater. This inequality of examples, rather ſtrenghtneth then weakeneth the Argument and the cauſe. But let us ſee his diſſimilitudes.

G. Powel 1 Pharao thought his prieſts to profeſſe true religion, and diligently to obey him etc: But refractary Miniſters, though profeſsing true religion, yet doe obſtinatly (beyng blynded with ſuperſtition) refuſe to ſerue God etc:

Reply. As *Pharao* was in error touchyng the religion & obedience of his Prieſts, ſo are our Prelats touching our refractarineſſ and ſuperſtition, as hath been ſheewed. Our obedience to his Majeſtie is as good, as of the beſt of their ſyde. That mans obedience to a Mayor of a towne or to any other inferior officer of a Prince, is alwayes the beſt, that is moſt agreable to the pleaſure of the Prince himſelfe. In like manner, that obedience is beſt unto Princes, that doth beſt agree with the pleaſure of the Prince of Princes, and King of Kings. To obey the inferior without due regard of the ſuperiors pleaſure, is but flattery and fawnyng, not good obedience. So to obey Princes, without due regard to our dutie to God. For it is more prejudiciall and hurtfull, then beneficiall or profitable to ſuch Princes. See the words of *Samuell* to the Iſraelits. 1 Sam. 12. 15. & 25: & the example of *Ioab* in numbring the people by the commaundement of *David*, whereupon followed an exceeding plague.

The obedience of the moleſted miniſters to his Majeſtie: as good as the beſt Conformitans:

2 Sam: 24

Touching *the ſerving of God and his Church, in the faithfull and diligent function and exerciſe of the Miniſtery*; we are unjuſtly charged to refuſe it, for we humbly and earneſtly deſire it, aboue all maintenance: and for this deſire we are thruſt out of our livyng.

G. Powel 2 The *Monks* and *Fryars*, were put out againſt their wills for *Sodomie*,

mi, hereſie, Idolatry etc: The refractary Miniſters are willingly deprived for obſtinate ſuperſtition, in refuſing ſincerely to Preach the goſpell, not beyng conformable to the Chriſtian lawes of our Church, and Magiſtrat:

Reply. The more juſtly, that *Monks* and *Fryars* were put out, the ſtronger is the Argument for us to be provided for, that are put out unjuſtly: without objection of any ſuch foule crymes to us, as for which they were put out. Yet it is falſe, that they were put out for hereſie or Idolatry; though they were heretikes and Idolaters. For they were ſuffered ſtill in their hereſie & Idolatry, as well after their putting out as before. Neither alſo are we willingly depri ved, any othewiſe then *Marriners*, willingly throwe their goods over boord into the ſea, to ſave their liues and the ſhip the better. Of ſuperſtition I haue ſpoken often; this now I ad, that many account carefulnes to keep a good conſcience in ſmale matters as well as in great, to be ſuper ſtition. And in the meane tyme, themſelues care neither for great nor ſmal matters, any further thē there are lawes of man in that behalfe. As for ſuperſtition indeed, we are ſilenced and deprived becauſe we will not yeeld to humā Ceremonyes, that haue been and are ſuperſtitiouſly abuſed in the worſhip of God, and of Idols, amongſt the Papiſts, whatſoever they are amongſt us. It is alſo as falſe, that we refuſe to be conformable to Chriſtian lawes. Acts 27. 38:

Monks and *Fryars* could not haue kept their places, by ſubmitting themſelues: But theſe may by conformyng themſelues: &c. G. Powel

Reply. I know no condition of ſubmiſion offered to *Monks etc:* Touching the reſt, we thanke you for nothing. This is the curteſie of Prelats, to make us pay decre for our lyvings, even to buye them with ſinnyng againſt God, (as ſome of them are ſayd to doe,) with Symony, and otherwiſe. But we dare not accept them at the price. The reſt

haue been often answered. I haue not such leysure, to use *tautologies* as the answerer seemeth to haue had at the writing of his answer, as though he were connyng a lesson by heart, in feare of beating for forgetting the same.

THE 12. ARGVMENT.

Iames 5. 6
Apoc. 5: 8:
Ezra 6: 10
Genes: 20: 7

The prayers of all the godly are much to be esteemed. Especially of the Ministers of the word. Ergo *In this behalfe the Ministers now troubled, are the more to be respected.*

Marginall notes.

G. Powel a True: if they continue diligent in their vocation: But beyng mẽbers, rent and cut from the body of the Church of God in this land they are unserviceable for the same:

Reply. lib: de Adiaphoris:

What man? Haue you unchristened us? Are we now Heathen and infidells agayne? It may be you will say we are worse; yea you haue already called us *Apes*. Before also in a note we haue been secretly compared to swyne. But how then doe you call us your brethren? He is certaynly of a strange stocke, that hath Schismatikes, falss prophets, heathens and infidells, Apes and swyne to his brethren. But it were good that some of the Prelats that made the *Canons* and doe execute the same, did consider, in what danger they are by the statute of *Excommingment*, for making and executing *Canons* contrary to former laws, and statuts of this kingdome. Heere agayne behold, the admirable efficacy of conformity, as that wherein consisteth the life of the Church, and wherby men are members, yea Angels of the Church in *England*: & without which, men are not so much as members thereof.

G. Powel b Are they faithfull that fall from their rule of obedience?

Reply.

So long as we keepe our selues to Gods word, we fall not from our rule or obedience. For we acknowledge no other rule or obẽdience. *Luther* left the rules and obedi-

ence

ence of *Monks*: ſo many other left other rules of Popery. Yet, I hope you will not deny thē to haue been faithfull, or call them ſchiſmatikes. As for your rule and obedience of Conformity in ſome perticulars, many of us haue not fallen from them: Firſt becauſe we never yelded to them. 2 Becauſe to leaue Conformity, is not to fall, that is to goe downward; but to ariſe, that is to goe upward. *Bitter rootes ſpring up*, that is, come out of the earth frō beneath. Heb: 12:15 *But the way of life is on high, and every good and perfect gift cometh from aboue.* prov. 15: 24 They that haue left conformity, are more ashamed and greived for having been Conformable, then for leavyng it, though they pay ſweetly for it. Iames 1.17.

Further anſwer to the 12. Argument.

1 Neither are the prayers of Schiſmatiks much to be regarded: 2 Nei ther will the Honorable court of Parliamēt, altogether neglect the refractary miniſters: 3 Nether can the refractary miniſters in charity but pray for the high court, yea in caſe, they did not ſatisfie their deſire: G. Powel

This anſwer conſiſteth of 3 parts, according as I haue noted the ſame. Concernyng the firſt, it is not much to be denyed if men be ſchiſmatikes indeed, and not only in name. ~~Therefore~~ But touchyng that and the ſecond, neither the anſweier nor all the Prelats in the world: ſhall ever proue us ſchiſmatikes and refractaryes, as they unjuſtly terme us. For the third, albeit the High Court of Parliament would doe nothing in our behalfe, yet we will ſay with *Samuell, God forbid that we ſhould ſinne againſt the Lord and ceaſe praying for them.* Notwithſtanding it cannot be denyed, but that the more juſtice and kindnes we ſhall receiue from them or by them, either at this Seſſion or at any other heerafter, the more we ſhould be both bound and quickened to pray for them. But the zeale of the Parliament, in doeyng ſo much all ready for us as they haue doone, is worthy our remēbrance whilſt we liue. Though *Reply.* 1 Samuell 12:13 Geneſ: 20:7 Ezra: 6:10

436

it haue not that ſucceſſe preſently, that we haue deſired, yet we know not what it may haue in tyme, upon further conſideration thereof by his moſt excellent Majeſty, and by his wiſe and moſt Honorable Counſell. No ſeed groweth preſently: yea the beſt ſeed lyeth longeſt in ground (for the moſt part) before it appeare, eſpecially before it yeeld fruit agayne. That that is doone alſo, ſhall be a good evidence for us, and for the equity of our cauſe, as alſo againſt the Prelats, to all poſteritie; whatſoever reproches, and other indignityes in the meane time we ſuſteyne eyther by their ſpeeches, or by their vnjuſt writyng (vpon record) againſt us. But here is further to be noted, the contradiction or at the leaſt the contrariety of this anſwerer, even in this very part of his anſwer. For in the firſt parte therof he ſayth, *the prayers of Schiſmatikes are not much to be regarded.* Where his meaning by comparyng theſe words with other his termes of *being rent & cut of frō the Church, obſtinat, wilfull etc:* muſt needes be, that our prayers are of no regard. In the third parte notwithſtanding, he ſayth that we ought *to pray for the Parliament, though they ſhould doe nothing for us accordyng to our deſire.* Ought we to doe that which is of no regard, of no uſe, of no benefite, to no purpoſe? Shall not we giue account of every *idle word*, much more of every idle prayer? Yea are not the prayers of all obſtinat, wilfull, impudent, ſchiſmaticall and ſeditious perſons, and of all lyers, and falſe Prophets (ſuch as he hath often called vs to be) abominatiō to the Lord? How then are we bound to pray for the Parliament, or for any other? Are we bound to doe that that is ſinne, and wherof we ſhall giue an account?

Contradiction or cōtrarietie.

math. 12:23

prov: 15:8

Reply. 2 If they had ſtill made conſcience of their duety in their Miniſtery, their prayers had been much more effectuall.

Behold

Behold what conſcience theſe men make of ſubſcripti- G. Powel
on, Croſſ, ſurplice, conformity, and other perticular obe-
dience; that make no conſcience of preachyng: yea not of
commyng to their flockes once in a yeare; yea ſome not
once in 3. or 4. yeares. Is it not ſtrange alſo, that ſurplice
and croſſ ſhould ad ſuch efficacie to prayers? How merry
then would it be with *England*, if all men in all places,
were forced to were a red, blue, greene, white, or yellow
croſſ, vpon their hats, ſleeues, or breſts etc? And if every
man, woman and child might never pray privatly, or pub
likely, but in a ſurplice? Further I pray God, that ſuch as
make ſo light account of our prayers for them, doe not
by their hard dealyngs with us, force us to cry for help
from God againſt them, and then feele the virtue and ef-
ficacy of our prayers in this behalfe, to their greife. For
ſhall not God aveng his elect, which cry day and night unto him, Luc: 18: 7:
yea though he ſuffer long for them? I tell you he will aveng them
quickly. Let not this be lightly thought on. In the meane
tyme alſo, how vileſoever our prayers are in their judge-
ments; yet let this anſwerer & all other our greateſt adver
ſaryes underſtand, that they are not ſo in the ſenſe & fee-
ling of thoſe mercyes, that they doe dayly enjoye, as well
by our prayers, as by their owne. For our conſciences bea
ring witnes, our prayers are of faith, and in truth & loue,
we doubt not, but that the King and whole kingdome,
yea our greateſt adverſaryes doe dayly fare the better by
them. And this I feare would too ſoone appeare, if they
ſhould or could ſuſpend us from praying, as they haue
doone from preaching.

The 13 Argument.

We muſt pray the Lord of the harveſt, to thruſt forth labo- Math: 9: 23:
rers into the harveſt. God will not haue men onely to pray, but al- 38:

ſo to uſe other meanes. Ergo *The High Court of Parliament, muſt be the more careſull, to provide what they may, that godly and paynfull Miniſters whoſe labours God hath already bleſſed, may not by head and ſholders, be thruſt out of the Church, as they are.*

There is but one marginall note upon this Argument, which hath been often anſwered.

So alſo hath all his other anſwer to the ſaid Argument touching the ſowyng of the tares of ſedition, ſchiſme, faction, and diſturbing of the peace. All which doe rather belong to them that teach that a true juſtifiyng faith may be loſt, that there is no certeinty of Salvation, that plead for ignorance and an ignorant Miniſtery: (the mother of rebellion and treaſon, and all other ſinnes againſt God & man) and other ſuch like things.

THE 14. ARGVMENT.

Luc: 9:26 *In the time of perſecution, men ought not to be aſhamed of the word of Chriſt, but to confeſſe and ſpeake for the ſame.* Ergo. *They ought much more ſo to doe in the tyme of peace, in a kingdome, and to a King and State profeſſing the goſpell.*

Marginall notes.

G. Powel a As if that Diſciplinarian giddines, were Gods word.

Reply. Though you take your pleaſure of us, yet take heed, take heed, you blaſpheme not the ordinances of Chriſt. Such certainly are litle better thē mad men, who impute giddines *to the Diſcipline of Chriſt*, commaunded *to be kept* 1 Tim: 6: 13 *without ſpot and unrebukeable untill his appearing*. It is no newe thing for them that ſtands for Gods truth to be accounted *mad men, or beſides themſelues*, and in theſe dayes, *Proteſtants ſcared out of their wits*. But let them that now offend this way, and eſpecially that account Gods ordinances to be giddines, let them (I ſay) repent *and come to*

2 King 9, 11
Acts: 26, 24
Luc: 15: 17:

them

themſelues, leſt the Lord ſtrike them with a farre worſe ſpirit of giddines then yet they haue, which will not be caſt out by any meanes, no, *not by prayer and faſting*.

b Here againe the Supplicants confeſſe that we profeſſe Chriſt and his word. Why doe they exclame then? G. Powel

If you ſo call it, we do exclame as we doe, that we may profeſſe Chriſt and his word more ſincerely, without any traditions of men in Gods worſhip. The Churches of *Epheſus*, *Pergamus* and *Thyatira*, profeſſed Chriſt and his word and had many excellent things in them; yet our Saviour himſelfe exclameth, and calleth them to reformation of the few thinges amiſſe with them. So did *Paule* to the Churches of *Corinth* and *Galatia*. *Reply*

c Feare and weaknes forſooth, becauſe they will not partake with Schiſmatikes. G. Powel

Let ſcoffers and mockers take heede, that *he that dwelleth in the heaven laugh not*: yea that *the Lord haue them not in deriſion*: yea leaſt *he laugh at their deſtruction, and mocke when their feare commeth etc.* *Reply.* Pſal. 2. 4 prov: 1: 26

Further anſwer to the 14. *Argument.*

The argument followeth not: for refractary Miniſters are neither Chriſt, nor his word, as hath been declared before. G. Powel

It hath indeed been ſayd before: but by whom, when, or where hath it been declared and proved? Which of us hath ever ſayde that we are Chriſt or his word? As the Church is called Chriſt. 1. Cor. 12. 12. ſo both the Miniſters & all true beleevers are the ~~Miniſters~~ members of Chriſt. Laſtly, they that ſtriue againſt humane Ceremonyes in Gods worſhip, and for the ordinances onely of *Chriſt Ieſus*, doe ſtriue alſo for Chriſt and his word. *Reply.*

THE 15. ARGVMENT.

As the Parliament hath had a godly care of ſeverity, for the better converting of the Papiſts, ſo likewiſe there ought to be the

440

like godly care for their good iuſtruction by ſuch able Miniſters, as againſt whom they may haue no iuſt exception. Ergo. *In this reſpect the Parliament ought to doe the more; for the liberty of the Miniſters ſuſpended etc.*

I defferr the reply to all the marginall notes, to the further anſwer following.

G. Powel As if there were not able Miniſters inough, in both Vniverſities & in other partes of the kingdome (if competent mayntenance might be procured for them) for every Congregation, without the ſmall hand full of ſchiſmaticall Miniſters.

Reply Part of this hath been anſwered before: yet to help the anſwerers memory (if it be weake) I tell him agayne, that if we had tentymes as many more, as there are, either in the univerſities, or elſe where, there would be uſe of them all. The Lords harveſt is great: the day is farr ſpent: the laborers that are, are ſome ſo weake, ſome ſuch loyterers, and ſome ſo unskilfull, that they make no cleane worke, but leaue as much behind them, as they gather and carry before them.

Beſides is it a ſmall matter, for the Miniſter to be acquainted with the people, and the people with the Miniſter? As likewiſe for the Miniſter to affect the people, and the people the Miniſter? Agayne, are all fit to teach & to governe the people, that are learned and good ſchollers in the *Vniverſity?* It hath been juſtly blamed by learned wryters of our ſide, that ſome Papiſts haue blaſphemouſly called the ſcriptures *a noſe of waxe, & a ſhipmans hoſe.* But now would God, it were not ſo made in open pulpit, by ſome great ſchollers, that are accounted great divines. Yea, it is lamẽtable, that in ſome great places (if not in the greateſt) men preach of the ſcriptures; and yet never interpret the ſcripture wherof they preach: yea that indeed ſo hammer the ſcripture, as though it were a peece of mettall, the which they

they might worke or caſt: into what forme themſelues beſt liked: who alſo make the Pulpite a place rather to ſheew their owne witt, wherby to win credit and prayſe to themſelues, (perhaps alſo to get a Biſhopprike in the end) then faithfully to deliver the meſſage of God, wherby to glorifie God, and either to winne ſoules unto him, or to confirme and further in godlines, thoſe that are already wonne. Laſtly, who rather playe with the ſcripture as if it were ſome gue gawe, then wiſely handle the ſame.

As for competent maintenance, I remember what one (that hath now turned his coate, and every where almoſt chafeth at vs like a *Cooke*, I remember (I ſay) what he once anſwered a Biſhop being asked, where he would haue ſufficient maintenance for preachers in every Congregation: *A good thong* (quoth he) *might be cut out of your hyde*. As alſo what *Iohn Baptiſt* ſayd unto the people, *He that hath two coates, let him part with him that hath none*. So ſay I, that for the better mayntenance of the goſpell where there were neede; there might be many a good ſhare had out of the ſurperfluity of thoſe, that maintayne their wiues in ſattin and dammaske gowncs, velvet kirtles, cheynes etc: that bring up their children like the children of Noble men, that fat themſelues and theirs, and ſtarue the Lords people: and who after their great abundance Preach not ſo much in 4 yeares, as they did before, in one. Luc: 3: 11

Suppoſe there were not able Miniſters inough for this purpoſe: Haue not the refractary Miniſters, then greater reaſon to joyne with their brethren in preaching the goſpell, confuting the Papiſts etc: then ſuperſtitiouſly to quarrell about croſſ and ſurplice, and to forſake their neceſſary vocation? G. Powel

Nay. Haue not the Prelats the more raaſon to ſuffer *Reply.*

112 us ſtill in the worke of the Miniſtery with them? We are all willing, ſo farre to joyne with any in preaching the Goſpell, as we may doe nothing againſt the Goſpell, to craze the peace of our owne conſcience. The anſwerer often charging us with ſuperſtition, cõvinceth them that ſay that we doe not that which we doe of conſcience. For if we be ſuperſtitious in not yeelding to croſſe, ſurplice, etc: then are they to us meere matters of cõſcience. For ſuperſtition is not in words, but hath her ſeate in the conſcience.

THE 16. ARGVMENT.

Epheſ: 2: 14 15: *As Chriſt Ieſus to make peace betwixt* Iewes *and* Gentils, *tooke away the Ceremonyes ordayned by God himſelfe, becauſe they had been a partition wall betwixt the ſayd* Iewes & Gentils: *and inſtituted no other in their places: ſo the Ceremonyes & other thinges now in queſtion, having been the meanes of much debate amongſt us, wherby the buildyng of the Church hath been greatly hindred, and the enimyes thereof ſtrenghtned; they ought in this reſpect to be removed.* Ergo.

The Miniſters now moleſted for the ſayd thinges inqueſtion, ought to be ſpoken for and releeved, and that by the Parliament, becauſe none may doe it better.

The Marginall Notes.

G. Powel a Hence appeareth what things they be, that the refractaryes are offended with, why then doe they pretend, the goſpell of Chriſt, reconciliation with God etc: *Ad populum phaleras:*

Reply. Theſe things being repugnant to the purity and ſincerity of ihe goſpell, under which God will not be worſhip

Iohn: 4: 23: ped in any ſuch Ceremoniall ſorte, *but in ſpirit and truth;* Being alſo ſuch, as for which the Miniſtery of the goſpell is reſtrayned (upon the liberty wherof dependeth the ſalvation of the people and their reconciliation with God) there

There is no cauſe, why ſuch ſcoffing and frumping out-cryes ſhould be made againſt us, as here & elſe where are made. Yea, though the miniſtery of the goſpell, were not for theſe thinges reſtrayned, yet being urged in the worſhip of God, they are unlawfull: and men ſtanding againſt them, and in all humility deſiryng them to be removed by lawfull authority, may well be ſayd to ſtand in Gods cauſe, and to plead for God.

c O, *Martin* was an modeſt man. G. Powel

Thanks be to God, that you haue no other then *Martin* to upbrayd vs with: who was unknowne what he was, and whoſe writing was never approved by us: and who alſo though he jeſted at ſome manners of your ſide, yet never wrote ſo bitterly as many of you now doe. *Reply*

d They will offend, and yet will not be told of it. G. Powel

You haue not proved us to offend, in thoſe thinges wherein you impute moſt offence unto us. If we doe offend, we are more then told of it: yea our puniſhment is greater then our offence, becauſe it is greater both then the law appoynteth, and alſo then the puniſhment of other whoſe offences are greater. *Reply.*

e Heat of contention may carry men further then were expedient. But are the refractaryes mylder in this kind? Witnes all their Pamphlets and libels written againſt us. G. Powel

The firſt parte of this note is plentifully juſtified, not onely by the booke *Scotiſh Genevating*, by the moſt ſcurrilous book of *The picture of a Puritan*, and by the anſwerers owne booke *De Adiaphoris*, but alſo by this preſēt anſwer, injoyned and allowed by authority: wherein (for ought I know) there are more rayling, ſcoffing, and untrue ſpeeches, then are in all the bookes here unjuſtly termed pamphlets and libells. If any notwithſtanding of us doe offēd in this kind, they are not iuſtified by the reſt: yet this is *Reply.*

444 not to be forgotten, that they that be the loosers, and goe away with the blowes, may be the better borne withall, in their words.

G. Powel f A disgracefull terme. But doe they acknowledge themselues non conformitans and schismaticall?

Reply. If the word conformitan be a disgracefull terme, is ther not disgrace in Conformity and being conformed? For are not these words *Conformed, conformity, and conformitans coniugata?* Why then are we urged to conforme? Eyther therfore you justifie vs in not conforming our selues (for who would disgrace himselfe?) or else you doe ill to say, we call you by a disgracefull name, when we call you conformitans.

G. Powel g Suam scabiem affricant.

Reply. It needeth no answer. All men know and dayly heare, how they galle us in every sermon, and how litle we deale with them.

G. Powel h A malicious lye. There are fewe or none in the Church of England, so ignorant and so scandalous in the Ministery, as here the suppliants insinuat: and if any such be amongst us, sure I am that (upon complaint and intimation otherwise) they are severely censured and punished for it. Yet I must giue them to understand, that scandalous Ministers for life, are more tolerable in the Church, then such as be factious, Schismaticall, or scandalous for doctrine, and phanaticall conceits. *Plus enim nocent doctrinæ scandala, quam morum delicta.*

Reply. Neither malicious, nor lye. All men, good & bade doe too well knowe, too many both ignorant and scandalous to be in the Ministery. If it might please his most excellēt Majestie, or his most Honorable Councell, to send out Commissions into all Countryes, and to appoynt indifferent Commissioners (neither Bishops nor any other Prelaticall persons, because such are partyes, but religious Noble men and gentlemen) to inquyre of this matter, the truth would much better appeare to the everlasting

se-

reproch, of all thoſe that doe ſo juſtifie the preſent ſtate of the Miniſtery. For the reſt of the former note, who knoweth not, that one lewd perſon (how baſe and abject ſoever) may, and dayly doth procure & worke more trouble to a good Miniſter, and doth more eaſily prevaile to his ejection, then twentie good men (though of never ſo good credit) yea, then ſomtymes the whole Pariſh beſids (though never ſo great) can doe for the good and peace, of the beſt Miniſter? That alſo for a man, not to were a ſurplice, or make a croſſ in the ayre (or I cannot tell wher or how) etc: ſhould be leſſe tolerable, then many great ſinnes expreſly forbidden by God himſelf, is very ſtrang, yea lamentable, yea fearefull to thinke: much more to ſpeake and write: moſt of all to print, for all the world, yea for all poſterity to behold. Eſpecially, that a learned man, a divine and Miniſter of the word ſhould ſo thinke, ſpeake, write, and publiſh. If this be not to preferre the authority of mortall and frayle man, before the authority of the immortall and moſt mighty God, yea *to make the word of God of no authority by traditions which men haue ordeyned*, I know not what is. As for falſe doctrine, or phanaticall conceits, which of you all, can juſtly charge us with them, as many conformitans may be with divers poynts of Popery, with toyes in the pulpit (more fit for a ſtage, then for *Moſes chayre*) with fooliſh allegoryes, and with ſuch pleading for Ceremonyes, as that the people are not onely not edified, but alſo corrupted and infected: yea & the minds of thoſe that are judicious, and haue any taſt of goodnes, exceedingly wounded? The like commiſſion, that before I ſpake of, would ſheew the trueth of theſe things alſo. Mar. 7: 13.

G. Powel

i An impudent and lowd lye.

What an exclamation and accuſation is this, upon the Printers fault, in ſetting Conformitans for unconformitans? If mallice had not overſwayed reaſon, he might eaſily haue ſeen it to be ſo, by the ſcope of the author. I haue alſo ſeene (and ſo many other) divers copyes corrected heerin, with the authors owne hand.

The notes with (k) l) and m) are often anſwered. The Greeke word of the next note, the Printer for want of Greeke letters, was fayne to omit. For which reaſon alſo all the fallacies in the end of every anſwer, are left out: the reſt of the note followeth.

G. Powel n The tyme of the old Teſtament beyng expired, Chriſt aboliſhed the Ceremoniall law, and ordeyned the New Teſtament: what will they conclude from hence?

Reply That no Ceremonyes being inſtituted by God himſelfe ſince the death of Chriſt whereby the former were abrogated, God is therfore now to be worſhipped in ſpirit & truth; and that no man or Church whatſoever hath power to ordeyne Ceremonyes for the worſhip of God.

G. Powel o VVhat? Not any? No Sacraments? No other Ceremonyes!

Reply Not any. No Sacraments. No other Ceremonyes. For the Sacraments that now are, were ordayned before Chriſts ſufferings, and before the abrogation of the Ceremoniall law upon his Croſſ. Theſe words *goe teach all Nations, baptiſing them etc.* doe but ratifie and confirme that which was before inſtituted: as alſo make for the communicating of *the word and Sacraments* to the *Gentils*, which before had been peculiar to the *Iewes*. All other things now in the Church for the government thereof, differing from thoſe that were under the law, were ordeyned by Chriſt (or at leaſt he had given commaundement for them to the Apoſtles) before his paſſion, and therefore before the abrogation of the Ceremonyes. For Chriſt commanded

Coloſ. 2: 14: math. 28: 19 Rom. 3. 2: Pſal. 147. 19: 26

his

his Apoſtles to teach onely ſuch things, as he had *commãded them*: and the Holy Ghoſt was onely *to teach them althinges, and to bring althinges to their remembrance, which he* (Chriſt himſelfe) *had told them*. Mat:28:20: Ioh:14:26.

The (*p*) hath been anſwered in the marginall note with *h*) of the 5 Argument.

q Falſe. They are the bonds of ſociety, beſids other uſes for edificatiõ. G. Powel

Then, where there is no Croſſe and ſurplice, there is no ſociety; or at the leaſt but looſe and weake ſociety. But perhaps he meãeth no Lordly Epiſcopall ſociety, becauſe no *Ceremony*, no *Biſhop*. He may alſo meãe ſociety betwixt a Miniſter and his benefice. So ſome haue found it true. Touching the other uſes for edification, we deſire to ſee them. *Reply.*

r If the ſupplicants requeſt were granted in the Ceremonyes, yet would the refractary Miniſters be reſtles ſtill, untill they had altogeather brought in their New Diſcipline: and (peradventure) more reſtles then, then ever they were before: G. Powel

As the newes of Chriſt birth at the firſt troubled all *Ieruſalem*, ſo it troubleth all Papall Prelats to thinke of Chriſts cõmyng, in the *Diſcipline* that he hath ordeyned. Theſe wordes, *their Diſcipline and new Diſcipline*, are but marginall *Mathematicall* fictions. None of us deſire any thing of our owne, but onely the ordinances of Chriſt Ieſus: which cannot be otherwiſe called newe, then his commandement for *loving one another*, *is called a new commandement*. *Reply.* Iohn 13. 34

This Diſcipline we haue never attempted to bring in, by any unduetifull meanes, but by all humble ſupplication to the ſupreame authority, to which we acknowledge the eſtabliſhment thereof to belong. Therefore, that we will be more reſtles eyther before or after the obteyning therof then becommeth us, is but his owne imagination, frõ

the experience (perhaps) of the reſtleſnes of ſome Prelats, till they be Biſhops, and afterward till they come to be *Archbiſhops*. Yea thē alſo, till they get ſome further honor, yea till they haue ſuppreſſed all thoſe, that they think doe any wayes diſlike of ſuch places. If it might pleaſe his Majeſtie and the other States of this Kingdome, but to permit it in ſome places where it might be moſt conveniently, it ſhould much more clearely appeare, both how we would content our ſelues with all humble thanks to his Majeſtie and to the other States in that behalfe: and alſo how much better this would agree with all Civill Magiſtracy, then their preſent Hierarchicall and Eccleſiaſticall goverment doth: yea how farre more beneficiall it would be to the Common wealth: and finally how untrue many other imputations are, whereby it is commonly diſgraced. If any ſhould abuſe the ſame, or himſelfe in the execution therof, we never denyed, but that ſuch offenders ſhould be ſubject to the cenſure of his Majeſtie, or of any his inferior officers.

G. Powel s Sound and ſolid peace, will never be wrought, but by recalling the refractary Miniſters from Schiſme and faction unto perfect obedience.

Reply. You muſt firſt proue us to be in a ſchiſme and faction. In the meane time, ſound and ſolid peace would a thowſand tymes better be made by removing all humane Ceremonyes, by a more free preaching of the *goſpell of peace*. If all Miniſters ſhould conforme themſelues, yet if the goſpell ſhould be ſincerely preached, (though never any word ſhould be ſpoken againſt the Ceremonyes, and other thinges in controverſie particularly) certeynly, the Ceremonyes and other matters now in queſtion, would be as odious, and in as great diſgrace as now they are. It is therefore a vayne thing to labor for peace, without removing

449

ving of thoſe thinges. Touching obedience it can never be perfect to man, where it is not found towardes God. The eſtabliſhing of Gods ordinances, will teach & worke perfect obedience unto men, to whom obedience is due.

Further anſwer to the 16. Argument.

1 If the queſtion be but ſubſcription, croſſ etc: wherefore then, haue they maynly cryed out, that it was the cauſe of God etc: G. Powel

All this is often anſwered. The leaſt tranſgreſſion of Gods word, and the leaſt obedience to Gods word, is the cauſe of God, as well as the greateſt. I wonder the anſwerer was not aſhamed, ſo often to repeate the ſame things. *Reply*

2 VVe hold not Subſcription, Ceremonyes, etc. abſolutly neceſſary to ſalvation, nor to be impoſed upon every Church (for why ſhould not other Churches uſe their liberty?) Yea our Church hath power to alter theſe particulars, yet we know ſome ordinances neceſſary for gathering aſſemblyes, eſtabliſhing of a Church, and be as it were bonds and links of ſociety. G. Powel

How doth the firſt poynt of this anſwer agree with that that ſome of the great Prelats hold, that their authority *is Apoſtolicall, and the Ceremonyes matters of order and decency?* Are not thinges Apoſtolicall and decent, common to all Churches? Or may our Church, alter that that is Apoſtolicall? Or why ſhould theſe ceremonyes, be more neceſſary for our Church, then for other Churches? Or not decent for other Churches, and yet decent for ours? If alſo Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction, be in veſted into the crowne, except the King and with him the officers of the crowne, be only the Church; our Church hath no power to alter them, having no *Eccleſiaſticall iurisdiction* reſident in it ſelfe. The latter part of this anſwer is needles, our aſſemblyes beyng already gathered. What a fooliſh & groſſ abſurditie alſo is it, to inſinuate that an inviſible croſſ, or a ſmockiſh ſurplice, ſhould be of any effecacy for gathering of aſſemblyes? *Reply*

G. Powel 3 Yea theſe particulars, Subſcription, Ceremonyes etc, being jmpoſed by the Church and commaunded by the Magiſtrate, are neceſſary to be obſerved under payne of ſinne, ſeeing he that reſiſteth authority, reſiſteth the ordinance of God.

Reply What if they be commanded onely by the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, not jmpoſed by the Church? Or jmpoſed by the Church onely, the Magiſtrat beyng an infidell, or a perſecuter of the Church? Can payne of ſinne alſo be without payne of damnation? Are not thoſe things that are to be obyed, under payne of damnation, neceſſary to ſalvation? Hence alſo it followeth, that things once commaũded by the Church or Magiſtrat (eſpecially by both) are as holy, as the jmmediate commandements of God. The particular inconveniences and abſurdities heerof are infinit. What alſo is heere ſayd, that was not wont to be ſayd by the Papiſts againſt the Martyrs?

contradictiõ

G. Powel 4 That they are thinges indifferent etc. and may be uſed without ſinne we haue proved in a booke *De Adiaphoris*.

Reply. Alas *M. Powell*, make not ſuch account of your booke *De Adiaphoris*, then which, there never came more ſimple ſtuffe from any man reputed learned. You had neede to recant your blaſphemous poynt therein, againſt the authority of Chriſt Ieſus for making lawes in his Church. Uerily you might as well haue denyed him to be a King, and a redeemer. To the 5 part of this anſwer unto this 16. Argument, reply hath often been made. That thes things are become bones of contention, is onely the fault of the Prelats, that ſtriue with might and maine for them. They acknowledge that they haue power to alter and remoue them, and they ſee great reaſon ſo to doe: neither can they giue any reaſons but childiſh for continuance of them, and yet to the great diſhonor of God, and to the greefe of thowſands of the godly, they retcyne them. For our

parte

parts, if we were not troubled for them, we would be so farre from contending about them, that we would never aske after them, neither would we care if we never saw them.

THE 17. ARGVMENT.

God hath lately visited us with a fearefull pestilence, which yet is not ceassed: and the end of all his chastisements is, to make us all the better by them. Yea to make us more Zealous: which if we doe not, he threateneth worse thinges unto us. God hath also lately mightely delivered us, from the greatest danger, that ever any people were in: to this end also that we might prayse him the more: and that all Estates may more seriously consult and deliberate, what to giue unto the Lord for all his benefites. And this is the more to be considered, because the Lord tooke the unthankfulnes of Hezekia *in a small matter for his health, very unkindly. This our former deliverance also was the greater, because it was wrought without the meanes of our prayers.* Ergo

Psal. 94:12: Heb. 12:19. Revel:3:19 Levi:26:18 Iohn 5:14: Psal:193: Psa:116:12 2 Chron:32 25:

The High Court of Parliament, ought to be the more Zealous for the gospell etc: the rather now, because they know not (at least many of them) whither ever they shall haue the like opportunitie agayne or no. Yea that so also, their thankfulnes may be as publik and renouned, as our deliverance: Yea, their zeale must be the more against all Popery (in respect of our danger by the Papist) for the rooting out of every stump thereof, that their soules may haue the more comfort, especially in death: and that their memory may be the more honorable, with all posterity.

This is the generall substance of the 17. Argument, though amplified by many perticular places, examples of scripture. Now let us see what is sayd against the same, in the notes, and in the Further answer.

Marginall notes.

a The mistake the ends, as those Gentiles did, who affirmed they G. Powel were

were plagued, becauſe of the Chriſtians contempt of their Gods.

Reply. Nay, you haue forgotten your Logike, in miſtaking the end for the efficient cauſe. The *Gentils* did not affirme themſelues plagued, to the end the Chriſtians might contemne their Gods, but becauſe they thought they had contemned their Gods. This error is in all the anſwer following. For the author tooke not upon him, to particularize the ſinnes for which God had viſited the land, but onely to ſhew what the Lord looked for from us, both by his works of Iuſtice, and alſo by his workes of mercy and goodnes amongſt us. Therefore the notary and anſwerer in all that followeth, ſitteth beſides the cuſhion. Agayne, what doth this note elſe import, but a ſoothing up of theſelues and of all other in their ſinnes, that they may not enter into perticular examination and judging of themſelues? When as euery man, and every ſtate ſhould perticularly cenſure and judge himſelfe and his ſinnes, to haue had a ſtroke in provoking the wrath of God ſo againſt us. And therefore happy had it been for the Prelats, if they had ſmitten themſelues upon the breſts, for their hard dealing with the Church, in reſtraynyng the Lords ſervants, that would haue given every oue in the Lords houſhould, his portion in due ſeaſon. So happy alſo were it, if every other ſtate and perſon, would doe the like touching their perticular ſinnes.

The ſecond note with (*b*) is nothing: becauſe the ſchiſme is not yet proved againſt us. Though we deny not, but that for our ſinnes, the Lord hath viſited this land as well as for the ſinnes of other, yet not for any ſchiſme of ours. The like I ſay for the like cauſe, of the note with (*c*) And though it behoveth the Parliament, eſpecially, to conſider of the workes of God, (as repreſenting the body

of

of the land,) yet I wiſh all other likewiſe to conſider of the ſame.

a I will not deſcant of the Suppliants meanyng, in alleaging this example. The wiſe may conſider it. G. Powel

So the wiſe may conſider, how fooliſh malice is, for want of matter from words, to wrangle with a mans meaning, The example is good and holy. The *Bee* will gather hony, out of a ſtinkyng weede: but the *Spyder* ſucketh deadly poyſon, out of the fayreſt and ſweeteſt flower. The flatterer careth not what he ſay againſt one, ſo that he may pleaſe another. *Reply*

e To wit by ſetling the ſtate thereof, againſt hereticall Papiſts, and ſchiſmaticall refractaryes. G. Powel

I grant this; it beyng underſtood of ſuch ſchiſmaticall refractaryes, as in part rent themſelues, both from the Apoſtolicall doctrine, and alſo from the auncient Apoſtolicall Churches, as likwiſe frō all other Churches throughly in doctrine reformed: and ſo ſtand in *medio*, betwixt ſuch Churches, and the Romiſh Synagogues. Who alſo beyng admoniſhed thereof, in duetifull manner by their brethren; yea by ſome ſpeciall works of Gods loving ſeverity, doe perſiſt in their ſayd ſchiſme, in a moſt refractary manner. *Reply*

f As if no good could come unto the Church, but the reſtitution of ſchiſmaticall Miniſters, which is indeed no good. G. Powel

Reply.

Let the reader be pleaſed to ſee, whereupon this note is gathered, and he ſhall ſee, that there is no ground therof. The author onely asketh a queſtion upon former premiſes, whether ſuch and ſuch thinges conſidered, the Parliament would diſſolue their meeting without doeyng any further matter in that behalfe (that is for the Miniſters pleaded for) then they had donne. He doth not ſay, without doyng any good, but any further matter, inſinuating

thereby, that they had done ſomething allready: agayne he ſpeaketh not of all cauſes, but only ſayth, *in that behalfe.*

Sophiſtry. But this is the anſwerers ſophiſtry, often detected. Howſoever he ſay no good hath been done by Miniſters whō he calleth refractary, yet thowſands that feare God can teſtifie, that the Church hath received more good by ſuch Miniſters, then ever it hath or will by any Papall Prelats, careles Non-reſidents, trencher chaplins and idle bellyes, *that ſeeke their owne, and not the thinges that are Ieſus Chriſts*, and who are noted, in all publike meetings for reformation of abuſes, more to hinder then to further all good motions againſt the Papiſts, againſt ſwearing, & for the religious obſervation of the Saboths etc, then common Chriſtians, at the leaſt then thoſe, that they doe contemptuouſly call laye perſons.

G. Powel g What godlines is there, in wilfull and malicious confronting the Magiſtrat, in repinyng at their brethren, and ſuperſtitious for ſakinge their callings, flockes and all to the vndoyng of themſelues, their wiues children, and frends?

Reply. None at all. But who doe more comfront the Magiſtrat in all kingdomes, then Papall Prelats, that hold their owne juriſdiction to be *iure divino* by Gods law, and that therefore deny all *Eccleſiaſticall iuriſdiction* to be abſolutly inveſted into the crowne of thoſe kingdomes where they liue, that take upon them to deale withovt law, beſides law, and directly contrary to law, and that many wayes oppreſſe the Magiſtrats ſubjects at their pleaſure? As for us, I haue ſayd before, I ſay agayne, and it is publiſhed to all the world in the booke intituled, *A proteſtation of the Kings Supremacy*, that we are ſo farr from confronting the Magiſtrat, that we attribute much more unto him, then all the Prelats doe. Touching repinyng at brethren, I know none guiltie heerof, except wiſhing that Chriſt Ieſus

sus may haue his owne, the Church her owne, the Magistrate his owne, the Ministers of Christ, and the subjects of the Magistrat their owne, yea every *Byrd* to haue her owne feathers, I know none (I say) to repine, except wishing of these things, and that every mortall man would content himselfe with his owne, be to repine. The rest of this note hath been answered.

455

h A calumnious censure. G. Powel

What? To say that vnworthy persons are thrust out into some of their places that are deprived? A man need not to ascend into an high mountaine, or to ryde many myles out of *London* for proofe therof. *Reply*

The next note with (*b*) after (*h*) and before (*a*, (as though the Notary had forgotten his alphabet) is often answered. The next note also with (*a* (after *b*) is not worthy of answer.

I VVe must wisely distinguish between such things as are proper to the Papicy, and what they haue by vsurpation, but are proper to the true Church of God. G. Powel

Are *Coapes*, *Surplices* and *Crosse etc*: proper to the true Church of God? If they be not, why is this noted upon the authors petition in this Argument, for removing of Popish ornaments? If they be, then either it is no *Church*, or an imperfect Church, that wanteth them. *Reply.*

m Proper thereunto. G. Powel

Are no appurtinances of *Romish* religion to be hated, but such as are proper thereunto? This is wonderfull. For what appurtinances are there of *Romish* religion, which agree not either with *Iudaisme*, or *Paganisme*? We are therfore to abhorre whatsoever appurtinance of Romish religion, whereof there is no necessary use in the service of God, and which were better abolished, then reteyned. Thus much to the marginall notes, of this 17 Argument. *Reply.*

456 In the reſt of the anſwer he dealeth deceitfully, racking di vers particular examples, applyed by the author, only for amplyficaton and illuſtration of this generall Argument, or of ſome perticular branch thereof, racking (I ſay) ſuch perticular examples, and applying them to the maine con cluſion and petition, as intended by the author for a ſeve- rall Argument to confirme the ſame. Wheras in like man ner, he might haue done the like with divers other perti- culars in this generall Argument comprehended. But let us ſee what he ſayth.

Further anſwer to the 17. Argument.

G. Powel In this Argument the Suppliants doe certeynly very worthily & chriſtianly diſcourſe, as of ſundry other things, ſo eſpecially concerning the Lords great mercyes etc.

Reply. In theſe words, let the contrariety of the anſwerer, to almoſt in his whole anſwer written, be obſerved. For he being a ſcholler, his words muſt be ſchollerly interpreted. Becauſe therfore we are not to doubt, but that the anſwe rer remẽbreth, as well what he hath learned in the *Ethicks*, as in the *Elenchs* of *Ariſtotle*, may it pleaſe the reader to vn- derſtand, or (rather) to remember, that *Ariſtotle* in his ſayd *Ethicks*, maketh great difference, betwixt *bonum* & *bene*, good and well: *iuſtum* and *iuſte*, that which is iuſt, and juſt ly. For he teacheth, that good & juſt things may be done, by evill and vnjuſt men, which haue not the habit eyther generally of goodnes, or perticularly of Iuſtice: but he ſayth, that only good and juſt men, which haue the habit Marc: 6: 20: of goodnes and juſtice, can doe things *well and iuſtly*. And this diſtinction is agreable to holy writ. For *Herod* is ſaide to haue done many thinges; viz. that were in themſelues good: the like may be ſayd of *Saule* and divers other. But certaine it is, that evil men can not doe any good or juſt thig,

well

well and iuſtly. This commeth onely from the ſpirit of regeneration, and from a true faith wrought thereby, *without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God.* For as much therfore, as this anſwerer doth here teſtifie generally of the Supplicants, that they doe *diſcourſe* in this Argument not onely *of many worthy and Chriſtian poyntes*, but alſo *worthily, and Chriſtianly*, yea *very worthily and Chriſtianly:* yea alſo for as much as he ſetteth this downe for a certeynty, ſaying *certeynly*, how doth this, or can this agre, with all the reproch full termes before given by him unto them, *of Schiſmatiks Refractaryes, wilfull contenders with the Magiſtrate, preſumptuous cenſurers, wilfull and malicious confronters of the Magiſtrat, boaſters, lyars, impudent, blind and ignorant perſons, falſe Prophets, ſowers of ſedition, diſturbers of the Church etc?* For can it be ſayd of ſuch men, and that for a certeynty, *that they diſcourſe very worthily and Chriſtianly of ſundry things?* Let it not be ſayd, that *to diſcourſe*, is but a matter of wordes. For their is the ſame reaſon of words and works. No man can ſay well and rightly that *Ieſus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghoſt.* Though an evill man therfore may ſpeake many *good and Chriſtian things*, yet onely good men, ſpeake *good and Chriſtian things, well and chriſtianly.*

Heb: 11:6.

contraritie

1 Cor: 12:3.

Doth God plague us, becauſe of the proceedinges againſt the refractary Miniſters? And not rather for our horrible ſinnes of ſecurity, pride, unthankfulnes etc: This is certeyne: and the reſt unproved: G. Powel

Reply

I haue told you, of your miſtaking your Logike before. The author diſputeth not perticularly of the ſinnes that moved the Lord to viſite vs etc: but of the generall end wherfore he did both correct us, and alſo magnifie his mercy towards us. The which he applied to the particular poynt of favor for the Miniſters moleſted. Notwithſtanding, to anſwer your queſtion, though it cannot be denyed, that for other ſinnes the Lord hath ſo heavily

ſcourged us, yet why ſhould the ſuppreſſing of the Miniſtery of the goſpell be ~~co~~ncluded? Was, not to *receiue and heare the Diſciples of our Saviour*, which were ſent out by two & two but for a time to prepare men for the goſpell, ſo great a ſinne, that our Saviour pronounceth, that *it*
Mat. 10: 14. 15: *ſhould be eaſier for* Sodom *and* Gonorrha *in the day of iudgment then for ſuch a City, as ſhould not ſo receyue and heare his Diſciples*, and ſhall the ſilencyng, and depriving of ſo many Miniſters ſetled in perticular Congregations, and all ready bleſſed in their labors, be accounted no ſinne? Yea not onely the ſilencyng of them etc: but alſo, providyng that they ſhall haue no other meanes whereby to maynteyne themſelues, their wiues and children? God open your eyes to ſee, and moue your hearts ſo to cõſider hereof, that yee may not flatter your ſelues, but ſee your ſinne herein. Yea, becauſe your ſelfe ſpeake of unthankfulnes, as one ſpeciall ſinne provokyng Gods indignation, what greater unthankfullnes can there be, then ſo to intreate his ſervants, whom he hath ſo graced and bleſſed? *Iudge*
1 Cor: 11. 31 *your ſelues yee Reverend Fathers* (that are principall actors in this matter) *that yee may not be iudged of the Lord.* Take heed (I humbly beſeech you, in the feare of God) take heed (I ſay) in time, leaſt fire breake forth frõ the Lord, and there be none to quench the ſame. In the deſtruction of *Ieruſalem* by *Nebuchadnetzer*, and the carying of the people away captiue to *Babell*: and in the laſt deſolation of the
2 Chron: 36 16: ſame City by the *Romans*, the like miſuſing of the Lords
Mat: 21. 35: 23: 37: Prophets is ſet downe as one principall cauſe therof. And who I beſeech you, in ſuch miſuſage of the Lords meſſengers, had alwayes a principall hand? Had not the Prieſts of the Lord, that ſhould haue done the contrary? Serch the ſcriptures, and ſee if they bare not witnes in this behalfe.

If

If God once ſet things in order before you, ſhall it be ſufficient Pſal: 50. 12:
to pleade, that the Miniſters of his word, againſt whom yee haue ſo proceeded, were *Schiſmatikes, refractaryes etc.* Alas, alas this wilbe but a weake plea. Yee haue herd before, that the Prophets were ſo termed.

Laſtly, concernyng the particular ſinnes by you mentioned and other the like, from whence doe they more proceede, then frō the reſtraint of the word, by the Preaching wherof, they would be eyther repreſſed or reſtrayned? If the libertie and free paſſage of the goſpell, worke an holy feare, humility, and duetifull thankfulnes, yea, if the preaching of the word, doe reſtrayne the moſt wicked and reprobate themſelues, that they bite in their lips, hold their hands, and refrayne from many ſinnes, which otherwiſe they would commit, (as it cannot be denyed) doe not ſecurity, pride, nnthankfulnes, & all other ſinnes come from the reſtraint of the word?

The anſwer to the Second ſuppoſed Argument, in this 17 conteyned, hath in part been anſwered before, becauſe it hath been proved, that we are no Schiſmaticall Miniſters. Touching the reſt of the ſayd anſwer, we deny not but that there are other meanes wherby that Honorable Court, may teſtifie their thankefulnes, yet this hindreth not, but that this may alſo be one: yea if it be granted that there are other, then by vertue of relation, this alſo muſt be granted to be one. Yea, if mercy to the ſoule, be more then mercy to the body (as the ſoule is better then the body: and the miſery of the ſoule greater then of the body; and cruelty to the ſoule worſe then to the body) then it followeth that this is a ſpeciall & principall meanes, wher by to teſtifie their thankfulnes.

His anſwer to the third ſuppoſed argument in the 17

Argument hath alſo been anſwered. The ſame I ſay of his anſwer to the 5 ſuppoſed argument. Onely therin the anſwerers cenſure of the Parliament if they ſhould reſtore us, is to be obſerved, viz. that *they ſhall not onely attract guilt and remorſe of Conſcience, but alſo preiudice their Honorable age, and make their names reprochfull to all poſterity.* This toucheth not only the Lords of the upper houſe, and body of the Commons in the Netherhouſe, but alſo his moſt excellent Majeſtie, without whoſe Princely authoritie nothing can be done by the other. Let all Prelats that pleade more ſtoutly for ſuperſtitious Romiſh raggs, then they doe duly regard Gods holy ordinances, let ſuch Prelats rather take heede, that ſuch things as are here threatned to the Parliament by the anſwerer, doe not be fall unto them.

Whereas the anſwerer, in his anſwer to the 14 ſuppoſed Argument betwixt the third and the fifft, reckoneth us up (in the bitternes of his ſpirit) with all Schiſmatikes, Heretikes, Papiſts, Athiſts, murtherers, theues, cutpurſes, etc: therin he ſheeweth his brotherly loue and kindnes to wards us, and how well he ſpareth us. But ſith *Chriſt Ieſus was coũted among the wicked*; yea *crucified betwixt two theeues.* yea, and had alſo a murderer preferred before him; why ſhould we his ſervants, wretched men, and great ſinners be greeved or aſhamed, thus to be reckõed with ſuch vile perſons? Yea rather we may the more comfort our ſelues, becauſe *if we ſuffer with him*, we are the better aſſured *that we ſhall reigne with him*, who hath prayed the Father, *that we may be with him, even where he is, to behold his glory.*

Eſa: 53:12
Mar: 15:27.
2 Tim 2.12
Iohn 17.24

G. Powel

The inſtance of *Iael* is altogether different, For *Siſera* was a ſpeciall enimy of the children of Iſrael, and Church of God, but the ornaments the Supplicants ſpeake of, are the good creatures of God, having no hurt at all in them.

Iudges 4.2:

Was

Was not *Sisera* also the creature of God, and in that respect may it not be sayd, that he had no evill in him? And is not the Pope also an enimy to the people and Church of God, as well as *Sysera* was? Yea is he not much more, in as much as he is enimy to their spirituall state, and everlasting salvation? Moreover, touching the ornaments of Popery mentioned in the Argument, doe we speake of them as they were the creatures of God, or as they were and are still by many Papists abused to Idolatry? What doth the answerer say for them, that might not haue been sayd *for the covering of the images of silver*, which the *Iewes* (that should truely repent of Idolatry) were *to pollute*, that is to account as thinges polluted; and for *the rich ornaments of the images of gold*, which also they were *to cast away as a menstrous cloth*, and (with great disdayne) *to say unto it, get thee hence*. What fallacy this is, the answerer knoweth.

Reply. 461

Isa. 30: 22

Sophistry.

Neyther were the Popish Priests ever decked with our ornaméts, neither are they now. Neither, were our ornaments ever worshipped, or abused to Idolatry, eyther are they yet. Neyther, if they had been, is it absolutly necessary to destroy the substance of them etc, but only to take away the abuse, and to restore the right use. The reasons are sheewed chap 11 *De adiaphoris.*

G. Powel

Are you sure, their is never a *Surplice* now in *England*, that was abused to Idolatry publikely in *Queene Maryes* time, or secretly sithens that tyme? If it be true of surplices, are you sure it is true of all *Coapes?* Nay rather, I scarse thinke, that there is not any *Coape* now, that was not in the time of Popery. Besides, haue you forgotten the distinction of *idem specie*, and *idem numero?* *Ahas* sent not the same Alter to *Ierusalem*, that was at *Damascus*, but onely commanded the like thereof to be made. By this reason also we may erect new images in Churches, (as some all

Reply

2 Kings 16: 10:

Exceter 462 Sophiſtry.

ready are in ſome places) and ſay that theſe images were never worſhipped or abuſed. Here therfore behold agaïe your ſophiſtry. Touchyng the ſubſtance of things abuſed to Idolatry, we urge not the deſtroying thereof, neyther doe we deny the reſtoring of them to any good civill, or naturall uſe from which they were firſt taken and imployed to Idolatry. But we deny that we ought to haue any ſuch honorable uſe, as to haue any place in the ſervice of God, who expreſly forbiddeth to be ſo worſhipped. I underſtand this of ſuch thinges as God hath not commanded, or wherof there is no neceſſary uſe. Such are the ornaments in queſtion. The objections againſt this are plentifully anſwered in other books. The 11. chapiter of your booke wherunto you referre us, is not worth the reading of a learned man. It conteyneth objections of your owne making not of ours. Which of us, was ever ſo mad, as to ſay, *que ad Dei gloriam fiunt, iis colitur Deus*. For are not the dutyes of the ſecond table performed for the glory of God? Is God worſhipped by them? This is to confound both the tables. Who ever alſo ſaide, *Quicquid fit ex fide et Deo placet, what ſoever is done of faith, and pleaſeth God, is the worſhip of God?* So our eating, drinking, and whatſoever elſe we doe, ſhall be the worſhip of God. I wonder you bluſhed not to impute ſuch thinges unto us, and to caſt your owne ſhame upon us.

Deut 12. 31

The third objection indeede in that chapter, touching the propoſition, is in part (yet not wholly) ours. But your anſwer thereunto maketh more for us then againſt us, as a child that hath well learned the principles of religion might eaſily ſhew. But I for beare anſwer of them, and leaue them to other to ſhew your childiſh weaknes there in, and in that whole booke. By the ſight wherof I praye

God

God you may ſee, what it is to write againſt the truth. In other things you haue written well, and we thanke God for your paynes: but in theſe cauſes your arguments are like fagots of thornes full of prickes without ſubſtance, bound with bonds of ſtrawe, which by the fire of Gods truth, are quickly burnt up, though for a time they fill a great roome, and ſeeme to make a great blaze: yea they are like to *ignis fatuus*, which terrifieth ſimple men, as if it were a ſpirit, but is in truth, but a litle fire of certeyne ſlymie exhalations: at the moſt they are but like a *Comet* or blazing ſtarr, which though it ſeeme to ignorant men, to be aboue in the ſtarrie heavens, with the fixed ſtarres, yet for all that is but in the higheſt region of the ayre, and at the laſt is diſſolved into winds.

Thus much for reply to the 17. Argument: yea to all. For to the concluſion of all (which the Notary & anſwerer unaptly call a diſtinct Argument) their is nothing anſwered requyring any further reply, then hath been alr ea dy made. This therefore ſhall ſuffice, for defence of the former Arguments. In the anſwer whereof, though (perhaps) there be the more ſcoffes, reproches, cavils, bitter ſpeeches, and uncharitable collections, to haue provoked us unto the like, that thereby ſome further advantage might haue been miniſtred unto them, againſt our cauſe and againſt our ſelues: yet as the author of the argumẽts, uſed not any ſuch word to provoke them, ſo I thought good to walke in the like ſtepes of modeſtie, that the defence of the Argumeuts might be the more ſuitable to the Arguments thẽſelues: that the author of them might haue no cauſe juſtly to blame me, for diſgracing his work and the cauſe it ſelfe by a contrary courſe: and that the mindes of the Prelats may rather be molified towards vs.

464

then any thing more exalperated againſt us. If it fall out otherwiſe, and that our mildnes doe ſtill increaſe their rigor, God (I hope) ſhall giue us patience, to indure whatſoever he ſhall ſuffer them to doe unto us: together alſo with ſuch comfort, as all the world ſhall not be able to take away from us. For we are ſo throughly perſwaded, from the evidence of Gods truth, revealed in his word: and ſealed up in our hearts by his ſpirit, the cauſe wherein we ſtand, to be the cauſe of *Chriſt Ieſus*, that we ſay with
Acts 21.13: *Paule, we are ready, not to be bound onely*, (neither onely to looſe our livings) but alſo (herein) *to dye for the name of the Lord Ieſus*. I ſpeake not this ſeditiouſly (and therfore let no man ſo wreſt my words) but I ſpeake, with that mind, and in that manner, that *Paule* ſpake the former words, to ſignifie our readines, for ſuffering any thing, which the Prelats ſhall do unto us: not for doyng any thing to reſiſt them. Some of thē harpe much vpon this ſtring, (as appe reth by wreſting of our words in moſt malicious manner in the former anſwer againſt us) yea, they ſeeme alſo to thinke long, for ſome law or other of this land to be wreſted againſt us, to make ſome of us examples unto other, by ſheading of our bloud; but if they ſhould ſo fare prevaile (which I hope they ſhall never doe, in the dayes of gracious and mercifull *King Iames*, nor in the dayes of any of his moſt Royall bloud) let them remember the words
Ieremy 26: 14:15 of *Ieremy* in the like caſe, to the Prieſts and Prophets that ſought his bloud, *As for me, be hold I am in your hands, doe with me as you thinke good and right. But know you for certeyne, that if ye put me to death, ye ſhall ſurely bring innocent bloud upon your ſelues, and upon this Citie, and upon the inhabitants thereof: etc. For of a truth the Lord hath ſent me to ſpeake all theſe wordes vnto you*. Yea, let them not onely remember thoſe

thoſe words, but ſo alſo take admonition by them, that in the preſence of God, they be not guiltie of high treaſon againſt our moſt Chriſtian Soveraigne, againſt his Royall iſſue, and againſt the whole land, by provoking the Lord, to inflict ſuch judgments upon all, as the wordes before mentioned doe inſinuat. We are in their handes, ready without any reſiſtance meekely to ſuffer any thing: but he that judgeth *righteous iudgment*, though he ſit in the heavens, *will looke upon it*, and one day (as *Zechariah* in the like caſe ſayd) *will requyre it:* as indeed then he did. 2 Chron: 24 22:

Not withſtanding, I am ſo farre from Prophecying or wiſhyng any judgment to the whole land, (though I cannot but feare it) that I doe, and will earneſtly pray, *ſpare* (this) *thy people ô Lord, and giue not* (this part of) *thyne heritage into reproch etc.* Yea, I doe the more hope of mercy in ſparyng us yet a while longer, becauſe of the great *multitude of the righteous in the land*: and becauſe perticularly of many that haue been and yet are (under Chriſt) *dreſſers of this the Lords vineyard*, that day and night (whiles many Prelats eate and drinke, and take their eaſe and pleaſure) *doe pray the Lord of this his vineyard, to let it yet alone*, and to ſpare it a while longer. But for all this, whoſoever ſhall procure the bloud of the meaneſt of us to be ſhead, (under whatſoever pretence) let them know that ſuch bloud, ſhall cry louder in the eares of the Lord of Hoſts, for vengeance upon the procurers therof, then ever we haue cryed in the eares, either of our moſt gracious Soveraigne (whom God long preſerue in perſon, and in vprightnes of heart) or of the High Court of Parliament for Iuſtice. If *their ſhall be iudgment merciles, to him that sheweth no mercy*, what ſhall the portion be of the cruell & bloudthirſty? Verely, though *they cry, yet the Lord shall not heare them.* Ioel 2. 17 Gen, 18, 26 Luk. 13: 8 Iames 2: 13: Pro: 21: 13

As alſo they that put the Martyrs to death, miſſed of their purpoſe, ſo ſhall all bloud thirſty and ambitious Papall Prelats. *Sanguis martirum, ſemen Eccleſie. The bloud of Martyrs is the ſeed of the Church: and fœcundi* (ſaith Calvin) *ſunt martyrum cineres. The very ashes of Martyrs are fruitfull.* The truth may be oppreſſed, but it cannot be ſuppreſſed: yea the more it is oppreſſed, the more it ſhall *bud forth & ſpring*. If one of us in this cauſe ſhould be put to death (though perhaps under colour of ſome other offence, by perverting of words, wreſting of law or otherwiſe) yet for that on, the Lord can rayſe up ten: yea, there is nothing that hath made, or doth make the cauſe of *Papall Prelats* more odious, and the reformation deſired, more gracious and honorable (even with ſome that before the conſideration of that which I now ſay, were of another minde) then the unjuſt, and eſpecially the unmercifull proceedings of ſuch *Papall Prelats*, againſt the ſeekers of reformation. Therfore in this caſe (as the Apoſtle exhorteth the *Philippians*) *we doe in nothing feare our adverſaries*, becauſe as to be our adverſaryes in ſuch reſpects, *is to them a token of perdition*, (if they repent not) ſo alſo, to be hated and perſecuted by the Prelats, is *a like token to us of ſalvation, and that of God*. But beyng ſo confident, why doe we conceale our names to our writings? Becauſe as *Chriſt Ieſus*, notwithſtanding all his heavenly fortitude without any defect, did for all that, oft tymes hide and with drawe himſelfe, from the furie and rage of the *Prieſts, Scribes*, and *Phariſes*, till his appoynted time was come, ſo doe we by this meanes, hyde our ſelues from the violence of ſome of our Prelats.

Epiſt: 243.

Philip: 1: 28

To your concluſion I will anſwer litle, becauſe it hath litle, that hath not been anſwered before. Wheras you ſay that

that *wordes are to be numbred to ſo great ſtates*, I anſwer that words are not onely to be numbred, but alſo for the quality, truth, modeſty, ſincerity, and equity of them to be weighed and conſidered; which if you had doone, your whole labor had ben ſpared. If you did *greiue in your ſoule, to heare us complayne of our povertie*, why doe you by bitter rayling, falſe accuſations, and moſt unjuſt & vnreaſonable wreſting of your antigoniſts words againſt all other Miniſters of his ſorte, *ad affliction to our affliction*: doe you not know, that by this circumſtance, *David* amplyfied his cõplaynts and deprecations againſt his adverſaryes? Is this *to iudge wiſely of the poore?* Whereas you wiſh us *to be a shamed of our feeding on shales, and huskes at other mens trēthers*, you miſtake your marke. For this belongeth not to us, but to trencher chaplins, that gape after dead mens ſhoes, or liue in miſerable hope of the livings of their brethren better then themſelues, to be unjuſtly deprived: and that in the meane time wayte at their Maſters table, till they haue ſayd grace, and then ſit down (if there be any roõe) at the nether end, after all the meate ſerved in. Who alſo are glad of ij s. vj d. or five ſhillings for examinyng ſome clarke preſented, to a benefice, or that (which is worſe) do now and then take a brybe, for allowing one to be ſufficient for the Miniſtery, that is ſcarſe fit to be a Miniſters clarke, except onely to helpe on with the Surplice: who finally (for the moſt part) are every tawny coates companion, to play at cards, tables (perhaps alſo at dyce) and at bowles etc: Yea ſometimes to drinke, quaffe, and all moſt *quid non*. All your reaſons out of *Arretius*, againſt *popular contributions* (as you call them) and for ſet ſtipends and tythes I paſſe over with ſilence, becauſe the author of the arguments hath commenced no ſute againſt yon in this

Pſal. 69 and 109. 16

Pſal. 41. 1.

408 behalfe. Therefore I leaue you to fight herein, with your owne ſhadowe. Touching you *M. Powell*, as *Iob* ſayd to *E-*
Iob. 16. 3 *liphaz, What maketh thee bold ſo to anſwer?* Or as ſome other read it, *what provoketh you ſo to anſwer?* So truely I cannot but admire the bitternes, ſharpnes, and unrighteouſnes of your pen (according as before I haue diſcovered the ſãe) againſt one that hath uſed ſo great mildnes in all his Arguments. Notwithſtanding remembring the fall of *Peter*, and the meanes therof, viz. His beyng in the high Prieſts Hall, and not forgetting his gracious repentance afterward, teſtified by many a ſalt teare, I doe the more pity your preſent ſtate, by cõſidering that provocation, which from other you haue had, ſo to write; and I doe the better alſo hope of your repentance. For though it be more adviſedly to write an whole booke, then on the ſodayne to ſpeake a fewe wordes, yet in other reſpects, I will not compare your fault in thus wryting to the fall of *Peter*, as equall therunto: and if you had ſo fallen, yet would I not, neither might I, deſpaire of your riſing. Only in unfained loue towards you, I do ſeriouſly exhort you, to take heed heerafter of any ſuch ſervice. Be not to readie, be not to ready, to be cõmanded ſuch a worke by any Prelat whatſoever. You may perhaps haue ſome reward in the end of ſuch paynes: (ſuch as men can beſtowe upon you) but looke more to that reward, that is in the right hand of the great maſter of all rewards. Remember well, what *Balaam* a ſorcerer refuſed at the hands of King *Balak*, beyng ſent for by very honorable meſſengers, *to curſe Iſrael*: yea, remember what a worthy anſwer he made, though himſelf
Nũb. 22. 18 were a moſt unworthy man. *If* Balack *would giue me his houſe full of ſilver and gold, I cannot goe beyond the word of the Lord my God, to doe leſſe or more.* Yea, remember (I ſay once agayne

agayne) how constant he was in the sayd answer. For he repeated it afterward, when *Balak* was much provoked, because he would not satisfie him in cursing of the Israelits, and threatned as much evill against him, as before he had promised and offred preferment. If such a person made such an answer to a King, and were so constant therein, should the Ministers of the Gospell be so easily commanded by lesse then Kings, to revise, and (in some sorte) to curse, so many worthy Ministers of Christ Iesus, which haue been valiant captaynes of his armyes against Sathan himselfe, and all his forces? Whatsoever you haue in this booke written against them, yet I appeale to your owne conscience for the contrary: yea you haue expresly before professed, that you hope they are *the Ministers of Christ Iesus, and in grace and favor with him.* Looke therfore heerunto in time, before you be too much hardened against him. chap. 24. 18

469

Touching the cause also it selfe, beware, yea, I say agayne beware, you sinne not for any worldly preferm̄et, against your former knowledge. Pleade not better judgment now, then before you had. *Examine your owne heart* (as it were) *upon your bed*, whether this plea be insincerity, or only from regard and hope of some prelaticall advancment. Psal. 4. 4

The more knowledge, the more dangerous it is to fall away. A litle disease is ofttymes the beginning of great sicknes. Small hurtes also at the first neglected, growe in the end to greevous and incurable sores. *Remember Lots wife.* Fynally *remember from whence you are* already *fallen, and repent, and doe your first works etc:* and let not the precious promises made to them in the word, that indure to the end, be forgotte̅. Wherof he that hath made them; make both you and me partaker, for his sake in whom they are made: to whom be all prayse and glory for evermore, *Amen.* Luc. 17. 32 Revel 2. 5.

Pag	Lin	Errata	Correct.
4	17	what	what?
8	5	intended	intended?
9	3	ſupeſtion	ſuperſtition
15	10	hage	haue
16	4	his	this
18	1	put out the,	
23	1	that loue	they loue,
31	12	they	ſome.
36	1	properly in matters that belonging,	that in matters properly belonging:
35	15	anſwer	order,
38	30	yeeld	yeeld to
42	20	and	us:
34	21	was	were
45	22	1 Pet.	2 Pet:
47	17	furthers	furtherers
52	vlt.		*ad* thing,
56	6	foo:	fooliſh
	19	haue	haue made
57	30	ſtamps	ſtumps
58	29	them	then,
59	4	put out two	
61	7	extraor:	extraordinarily
64	31	doth	doth he
80	14	vi	vis
81	24	and	in
87	28	ſo	ſo to be
91	1	and	an
94	9	crowe	crowne
95	18	depravation	deprivatiõ
	28	depraved	deprived

Pag	Lin.	Errata.	Correct.
98	9	duce	due
	29	tenex	tenax
106	11	performed	prefer,
	l,24	the:	for he: l:25 ther, for his
111	29	many	in any
119	18	exreſſa	expreſſa
121	11	he	he that
123	28	appertune	opportune
124	18	and	and be
126	22	to	of
129	17	the	that,
	21	therfore	but
130	28	this	the next,
	29	ſhould	ſhall
131	3	obedience	obedience to mens precepts.
133	26	Miniſters	members
134	5	deffer	differ
136	9	ſeat	ſeat is
140	3	cõformitans,	cõformitãs? l:5, ſo, for ſo haue.
142	25	by	and by
147	27	promiſes	premiſes
149	27	as	as are
150	22	Ethnicks	Ethiks
	vlt.	can	cannot
151	29	but	and
152	2	concluded	excluded
	16	herein	herein repẽt
154	16	14	4
	17	firſt	fiſt
156	7	we	they

Marginall Notes.

pag. 48. lin. 31 & Prov. 6. 19. pag 49 l 7, *John* 9 30. 31, pag 125, l 25: Cant 5. 7. pag. 131, l 16. Luk 10. 7 for Luk 18, 7. & l. 25 before over, ad that. pag 132. l 17, Luk 9: 2 for Luke 9. 26.

C 3522 X
21178 SL

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE

HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION